

the Defense Department through the closing months of the Eisenhower administration.

But the results of his few months as Defense Chief have confounded this expectation. Mr. Gates has won praise from Congressmen, gained respect from his subordinates, and even calmed much of the feuding among military services. While Secretary Gates certainly is a vast distance away from unsnarling all the Pentagon's problems, the consensus is that he has made some solid improvements.

Mr. Gates' detailed grasp of arms questions has gone far in blunting attacks on the President's defense program by Democrats in Congress who sought to make arms policy a top election-year issue. When a hostile Senator shot questions at him about schemes for keeping bombers on a full-time air alert, Mr. Gates quickly came back with three sets of figures to show the effects of such a maneuver. During other heated congressional hearings on defense, Secretary Gates has stoutly warded off Democratic criticisms with quick, careful explanations of the administration's program.

After the defense boss detailed the President's defense plans to one committee, a Democratic Congressman declared: "It is a very fortunate thing for us that we in America have you in the position that you occupy."

#### SETTLING MILITARY DIFFERENCES

By working more closely with the military chiefs, and making them work with each other, Mr. Gates has smoothed over much of the worst interservice bickering. The Secretary has devised a new technique for settling disagreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of the top man in each service plus a chairman named by the President. In recent years this military group has confused civilian officials with split decisions—differing advice—on such crucial questions as how many and what kind of weapons to have in the atomic stockpile, and how much emphasis to put on small, brushfire wars.

To settle such disputes, Mr. Gates now personally sits with the chiefs when they're thrashing out issues likely to produce divided advice. This way, he hears arguments firsthand, rather than just wading through lengthy "position papers" as did past civilian Secretaries. "We have succeeded in clearing up quite a few papers," Mr. Gates reports.

Another innovation introduced by the Defense Secretary is submitting the entire Pentagon budget to the Joint Chiefs who, amazingly, never studied the entire program before.

Rather than delay decisions on the continual shifts possible in selecting the best combination of evolving weapons, Mr. Gates has encouraged the services to propose changes. Even while the administration was publicly defending its existing program against political critics earlier this year, the Defense Secretary was quietly looking at ways to expand the long-range missile effort and hurry development of devices to detect enemy missile attacks. When military experts showed these accelerations were possible, Mr. Gates approved cutbacks in the less necessary antiaircraft defense weapons to pay for the missile speedup. Thus, he swiftly changed military plans without upsetting the President's budget.

Why is Thomas Gates a more effective Pentagon leader? Without discounting his native ability, perhaps the chief answer is something else: his governmental experience. Mr. Gates has worked for 6½ years in the Defense Department. Before taking the top defense post, he served first as a rather humble Navy Under Secretary, next as Secretary of the Navy, and then as Deputy Defense Secretary. And one might also count earlier

service as a naval intelligence officer during World War II and later as a Reserve captain.

#### KNOWING THE MAZES

"He came to the top job better prepared than practically anyone before him," observes a close associate of the Secretary. "He really knows his way through the mazes of this building." And, knowing the problems, he works to solve them.

While his predecessor, Mr. McElroy, often knocked off for frequent vacations, Mr. Gates frequently goes to the other extreme. One recent morning he arose at 5 a.m. to make certain he was properly prepared for a session with the hostile Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Majority Leader JOHNSON.

The dark, somewhat retiring Pentagon boss gets into his office about 8:30 each morning and stays until 7 p.m. or later. At lunch, he almost always has someone from the Defense Department as a guest so they can talk over problems. Mr. Gates depends little on staff work, though most top civilian defense officials do; he prefers to dig into the details of arms questions himself.

The tall (6 feet 2 inches) Mr. Gates, while hardly a publicity seeker, is aware he has a public relations role; he rejects a smaller proportion of Washington speaking invitations than did his predecessor. "He's a hard man to keep from doing things that tax his time and strength," remarks an aide.

One high official whose duties take him deep into Pentagon affairs remains convinced that the Defense Department is still wasting billions of dollars annually. Yet even this harsh critic is a fan of Secretary Gates, declaring: "He is the experienced, knowledgeable sort of man who could eventually set the place in order; we need this kind of executive at the start of an administration, not just at the tail end."

The story at the Pentagon is not unique. Experience in Government pays off in other places, too. George M. Humphrey, a top business executive, came in as the President's first Secretary of the Treasury with no previous background in government and was hailed as "strong man" of the Cabinet. Yet he proved to be inflexible, created hostility within the administration and in Congress, and failed to accomplish most of his aims. In contrast, present Treasury Secretary Anderson, who came to his post with political and Government experience as well as business background, has been highly successful.

And Percival F. Brundage, a brilliant accountant by trade, proved to be a weak Budget Bureau Director for Mr. Eisenhower. In sharp distinction, current Director Stans, with a similar background except that in addition he had learned his way around government by working in the Post Office Department, is a strong man in the Budget post.

The next administration can, if it wishes, draw the moral from these tales. It would seem to be: Businessmen have much to offer in Government, but peak posts should be given to those who have been seasoned in lesser Federal duties, gaining skill in the ways of Washington.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, April 29, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 8: 12: *He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*

O Thou infinite and gracious God, grant that during this day we may apply and act upon the words of our blessed Lord, the wisest of all teachers; the ablest and most willing of all helpers, who alone can emancipate us from sin and weakness, from fear and despair.

Inspire us, amid the vicissitudes of our mortal life, to put our trust in Thee and to walk by the faith which will make us courageous for all our duties and responsibilities.

We beseech Thee to sustain us in our loyalty to that which is noblest; enrich our hearts with love and good will toward all mankind; and teach us how we may serve Thy divine will in bringing redemption and peace to humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 743. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; and

S. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1961.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8042) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four CI-SAY-1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SCHOEPPLE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE 20TH OF JANUARY 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 92—and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS MAJESTY, MAHENDRA BIR BIKRAM SHAH DEVA, THE KING OF NEPAL

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President of the United States and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Majesty, the King of Nepal, into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; and the gentleman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Majesty the King of Nepal.

His Majesty the King of Nepal, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at

the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, we receive in this Chamber many distinguished and welcome guests. Today we receive here the head of a government whose people are a gracious and friendly people, and we want him to know that in this Chamber where we, the representatives of all the American people, are assembled today, he is very, very welcome.

I take great pleasure and a degree of pride in presenting to you the King of Nepal. [Applause, the Members rising.]

#### ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY, THE KING OF NEPAL

(The King of Nepal addressed the joint meeting in Nepalese. His speech was translated by an interpreter. The English translation of his speech follows:)

The KING OF NEPAL. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, we are very much touched by the warmth and spontaneity of emotions and feeling with which we have been received here. With a deep sense of honor and privilege we avail ourselves of the opportunity to address this august assembly. We regard this invitation to us as a token of your friendship and good will toward the people of Nepal who in their turn have nothing but the greatest respect and admiration for the great people and the leaders of the United States of America. [Applause.] It is my pleasant duty to convey to you and through you to all the citizens of this great Republic the sincere greetings and salutations of the Government and the people of Nepal.

Different nations have acquired influence and leadership in the world in different periods of history. But no other nation at its height of power and prosperity, glory and greatness had in the past thought in the same benevolent terms about poverty and hardships of the less fortunate people in other countries of the world as you have been doing in your own time. Your pioneering spirit in this field and dedication to the great and noble task of helping to alleviate the conditions of poverty and suffering wherever they may exist, have served to focus universal attention on this question of serving humanity as a matter of international responsibility.

We had till 12 years ago very little to do with each other even in the way of trade and diplomatic relations. Till then, few Americans had visited Nepal and the Nepalese who had visited America could actually be counted on the fingertips. With the advent of democracy in Nepal things began to change, and since the U.S. Operations Mission was set up in the country in January 1952, our contacts have increased rapidly and hundreds of Nepalese have come to this country for training and studies in various fields. Quite a few American technicians and experts have been to Nepal to help the Nepalese people with their problems of transport, economy, and agriculture, and problems of health and education. We are glad to be able to tell

you that the Nepalese have found the American experts friendly and helpful and always willing and eager to help the Nepalese out on their various problems.

Apart from the recent contacts we have referred to above, our common faith in democratic ideals and procedures provides, in our opinion, the lasting basis for greater understanding and cooperation between our two peoples and countries. You are all familiar with the strains and difficulties under which all newly established democracies have to work. The concurrent resolution passed by the U.S. Congress last year on the successful holding of the first ever elections in Nepal has served as a source of great inspiration and encouragement to the newly elected members of our parliament in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Provision for fully representative institutions of government and legislature, respect for fundamental rights and due process of law, respect for freedom and dignity of the individual are some of the basic principles that underlie our constitution. As is apparent to you, the constitution of Nepal is based on the concepts of law, liberty, and rights prevalent for a long time in your own country. Though our two countries are separated from each other by vast expanses of land and water, though our diplomatic relations even do not date very far back, there exists between us a lasting moral and spiritual bond that in effect transcends all these material and mundane considerations, a real identity of outlook and views on vital problems of man and society that is derived from common faith in common political principles, ideals and beliefs. [Applause.]

As a nation, we have always prized freedom more than anything else in our history, and the freedom of small countries is something which is very dear and close to our hearts.

We believe in an independent foreign policy of judging every international issue on its merits without consideration of anybody's fear or favor and in a policy of nonentanglement. Our record in the United Nations will also bear testimony to the above fact. This may sound a little idealistic and a little too impractical but as a small nation, we feel that this is the only way in which we can best contribute to the discussions and deliberations in the United Nations and to the interests of world peace and friendly relations among nations.

Our policy of nonalignment does not arise from our desire to sit on the fence or to evade responsibility in any way. It is merely a manifestation of our reluctance and unwillingness to compromise our freedom of judgment and action beforehand by committing ourselves irrevocably to support one side or the other even before the emergence of such an eventuality. We do not see anything immoral, or selfish, or passive about it. We do not believe in shirking action, once we feel satisfied and convinced about the right course.

Unfortunately, the world we live in is passing through a state of uneasy peace and tension between nations. The sooner this state of fear and uncertainty is ended, the better prospects will emerge



for mankind as a whole. This is something which is realized by all, but still it appears as though it will be some time before this realization can be translated into practice to the actual benefit of all concerned. However, men of peace and good will in every country must work and work ceaselessly and untiringly for peace and for the removal of the threat of war, because war under the present circumstances will mean nothing short of total destruction of human life and civilization.

Rightly have the great leaders of the world described disarmament, both conventional and nuclear, as the greatest and most pressing problem of our time. All the peoples of the world are eagerly awaiting the successful outcome of the Geneva negotiations on disarmament and a nuclear testing ban. Will it be too much to hope that the negotiations in Geneva will result at least in some limited agreement in this field which could be formally registered at the forthcoming summit meeting and announced to trembling humanity as a prelude to better times and broader agreements among nations in the near future? We hope and believe that the forthcoming summit conference and the ones that are proposed thereafter will have the effect of easing tension in the world and registering real progress toward peace, disarmament and settlement of the outstanding political disputes between nations. [Applause.]

We have not the slightest doubt about the peaceful intentions of the American people. [Applause.] Now it is for her to prove her initiative and skill in convincing other great and small countries of the need for the gradual evolution of a new international order based on freedom, justice and peace for all and fully responsive to the needs and challenge of the time. The way in which the great powers can meet the greatest challenge of our time and perhaps of history is by turning the present-day situation, fraught with the risks of nuclear war, into one of the pooling of the resources of the nations of the world for the eradication of poverty and needs from everywhere. We cannot help feeling that if even a small fraction of \$100 billion that is being presently spent on defense and war expenditure in the world is devoted to the development of the underdeveloped countries, the world would for everybody be an infinitely better and happier place to live in. [Applause.]

We have faced the devastating effects and grim consequences of the two world wars which took place during the life time of many in our own generation. The finest flower of youth and manhood in every country was decimated in the two world wars and we can very well imagine the sense of horror haunting the minds of the people heavily loaded with the bitter memory of the loss of their sons, brothers, and husbands. We hardly need emphasize that no nation in the world, big or small, will remain unaffected in the event of another global war. It is the sincere desire for peace and freedom in the hearts of the 9 million of our countrymen that has

prompted us to conclude this address with the following exhortation in the immortal words of your great leader and a great son of America, Abraham Lincoln, which, to our mind literally applies to the present day global context as well if we only replace the word "nation" by the phrase "international community":

It is rather for us, the living, to stand here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

[Applause.]

Thank you once again for giving us a patient hearing.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m. His Majesty, the King of Nepal, accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

#### DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Defense Department appropriation bill which makes appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT'S APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H.R. 10569, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the

United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. GARY, PASSMAN, CANON, CANFIELD, and TABER.

#### AMENDING WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4781) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, and page 2, line 1, strike out "for any of the purposes provided for by this Act" and insert "(as defined in section 2 of this Act)."

Page 2, after line 20, insert: "Sec. 3. Section 10 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No appropriation hereafter available for assisting local organizations in preparing and carrying out plans for works of improvement under the provisions of section 3 or clause (a) of section 8 of this act shall be available for any works of improvement pursuant to this act or otherwise in connection with the eleven watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented, or for making loans or advancements to State and local agencies as authorized by clause (b) of section 8.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this has been cleared by this side of the aisle?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It has been cleared with the Republican leadership, including the senior minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS ORDERED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

# AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COM- MISSION

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 513, Rept. No. 1559), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

# AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT THE SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CEN- TRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALI- FORNIA

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 514, Rept. No. 1560), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

# RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Senator MURRAY's retirement at the end of his present term will bring to a close a chapter in the history of Montana that Senator MURRAY has dominated for more than a quarter of a century. It will also bring a surge of affectionate recollection for kindness and service in hundreds of hearts in Montana.

Senator MURRAY has been identified as the leader of the Democratic Party in Montana for most of those years. His policies, his philosophy, his leadership have been inseparable from the Democratic Party. Yet it is not in this political area that Senator MURRAY has made his greatest contribution to his State and the Nation. He never avoided a controversial issue and has always firmly declared himself on the side which he thought was right.

His humanitarianism pulled him into the vanguard of a struggle for the recognition of the decency and dignity of all citizens. His fights in behalf of the poor, the sick, the oppressed have changed the attitudes of the entire Nation. Legislation on welfare, health, minimum wage, full employment bears the imprint of his philosophy.

Senator MURRAY came to the Senate relatively late in life after a distinguished career at the bar of Montana and a long record of meritorious public service. He was always concerned with the industrial development of his adopted State and of its resources. His concern for conservation and development of Montana's resources led him to a greater concern for conservation and use of the Nation's resources which, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he has translated into our national policies.

Senator MURRAY leaves the Senate at the end of his term after five straight elections. But the imprint of his personality and his philosophy on the whole United States will permanently endure.

Nearing his 84th birthday, Senator MURRAY is more progressive and more enlightened than many younger men. I join his hundreds of friends in and out of Congress in paying tribute to his many achievements and in honoring a great American citizen.

# FRANCE SHOULD SHARE OUR ATOMIC SECRETS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, General de Gaulle has been acclaimed as an inspired leader and statesman—the savior of France. He epitomizes a new France, strong, determined, liberty loving. His tumultuous reception is proof that the United States regards France as a staunch and true friend. The flowers, the cheers, the enthusiastic crowds are symptomatic of the warmth with which we regard De Gaulle and France. John Quincy

Adams said to the Marquis de Lafayette years ago:

We shall look upon you always as belonging to us, during the whole of our life, and belonging to our children after us.

We, the children mentioned, are happy to have France and De Gaulle and we welcome them on our side. We march together shoulder to shoulder to a better world.

De Gaulle has marched as a man of rare courage. See how he stood up to Khrushchev and in no uncertain language told him that Berlin was not expendable and Germany was not negotiable. He galvanized Western thought and stiffened the United States attitude vis-a-vis Russia.

See his determination amidst well-nigh insurmountable obstacles—a determination as firm as a rock.

See his faith; he has a faith in the language of Browning, to move mountains; faith in himself, his flag, and his country.

He showed an exultation that was as fierce as a streak of lightning and infected the whole country with enthusiasm.

In that courage, faith, exultation, determination, he shall lead France from strength to strength.

Then why not treat France as a full fledged ally? Why deny her admission to the nuclear club and put her to the inordinate expense and trouble of exploding atom bombs in the Sahara? If the President cannot do the needful in this regard under the present law, then amend the McMahon Act to permit him to do so. The danger of leaks concerning our atomic secrets is nonsense. There were no leaks from England. There would be none from France. As a matter of fact Russia knows as much, if not more, about atomic energy than we do. There is always the bugaboo or fear of "what after De Gaulle?" That question is often asked. The answer is that the nation that produced a De Gaulle can produce a successor. That question was asked concerning Churchill. England has not suffered with either Eden or Macmillan. The same question was asked concerning Stalin. The Russians seem quite satisfied with Khrushchev. The same question was asked in the old days concerning Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Our country prospered even after they were gone. The same question is now asked concerning Nehru in India and Adenauer in Germany. We need not worry about France. She is the only principal European country which has never waged war against us ever since our existence. It is high time that we ceased treating France as a stepchild anent atomic energy. Admit her to the nuclear club.

# DEFENSE APPROPRIATION REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.



## DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the hearings on the defense appropriation bill have been printed and are available, and that the committee report and the bill should be available tomorrow noon.

Printed volumes of the hearings have been made available for distribution as the hearings progressed. Volume 1 became available January 19 and volume 7 was released today.

The Committee on Appropriations is scheduled to report the bill at noon on Friday, April 29, and the bill and report should be available at that time. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] will no doubt announce when the bill will be considered by the House.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Alexander	Grant	Moulder
Ayres	Hargis	Pelly
Barden	Harmon	Pilcher
Bolton	Hollifield	Powell
Bonner	Jackson	Rabaut
Bowles	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Boykin	Keogh	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Kilday	Rooney
Burdick	Kowalski	Scott
Burleson	Lafore	Short
Chelf	McDowell	Siler
Coffin	McIntire	Sullivan
Cooley	McMillan	Taylor
Dent	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Martin	Thompson, La.
Dooley	Mason	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	Miller, N.Y.	Walter
Durham	Mitchell	Wampler
Frazier	Moeller	Willis
Gavin	Montoya	Young
Goodell	Morris, N. Mex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## EMERGENCY HOMEOWNER ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 10213, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had

read through section 1, ending on line 4, page 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and be open for amendment at any section therein.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the present policy of the Federal Housing Administration, insofar as it limits mortgage insurance under its regular residential housing program to cases involving loans made by corporate mortgagees and other commercial lenders, is preventing the effective operation of the program, particularly in the smaller towns and communities of the Nation. It is therefore declared to be the intention of the Congress and the purpose of this section to make mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing Administration's regular residential housing program more readily available in smaller towns and communities by specifically providing that individuals as well as commercial lenders may be approved as mortgagees for purposes of such program.

(b) Section 203(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph: "Nothing in paragraph (1) or any other provision of this section shall be construed as prohibiting or preventing the approval of an individual as mortgagee for purposes of insurance under this section."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 203(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all that precedes the first colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Commissioner is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title but in the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 301(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market".

(b) Section 304(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the last three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Association shall, from time to time, establish and publish prices to be paid by it for mortgages purchased by it in its secondary market operations under this section. The volume of the Association's purchases and sales and the establishment of purchase prices, sales prices, and charges or fees in its secondary market operations under this section shall be so conducted as to promote the interests of the national economy by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market to the maximum extent consistent with sound operation, and within the reasonable capacity of the Association to sell its obligations to private investors. The Association shall buy at such prices and on such terms as will reasonably prevent excessive use of the Association's facilities and permit the Association to operate within its income derived from such secondary market operations and to be fully self-supporting. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, advance commitments to purchase mortgages in secondary market operations under this section shall be issued only at prices which are sufficient to facili-

tate home financing, but which are sufficiently below the price then offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments."

SEC. 5. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and" immediately before "(3)" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; (4) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the Association (except as provided in clauses (1), (2), and (3), and subject to the authority of the Association to set a limitation on the age of mortgages which it will purchase) shall purchase any mortgage (or participation therein) described in this subsection which is offered to it unless the loan is in default or in imminent danger of default or title to the property is defective."

SEC. 6. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof (and immediately after the clause added by section 5 of this Act) the following: "; and (5) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act the Association shall not sell or otherwise dispose of any mortgage (or participation therein) held by it, except to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or one of its constituent agencies or to the Veterans' Administration, or as may be provided by contract or other obligation between the seller of the mortgage and the Association."

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 303(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": Provided, That with respect to mortgages which are purchased (or with respect to which commitments to purchase are made) by the Association during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, such contributions shall be equal to 1 per centum of such unpaid principal amounts."

SEC. 8. The second sentence of section 305(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that with respect to any mortgage which is purchased (or with respect to which a commitment to purchase is made) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the price to be paid by the Association shall be not less than the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items."

SEC. 9. The third sentence of section 305(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that with respect to any mortgage which is purchased (or with respect to which a commitment to purchase is made) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the charges or fees so imposed by the Association for its commitment and purchase shall not exceed 1 per centum of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage, and (unless the commitment was issued before the beginning of such one-year period) not more than one-fourth of such charges or fees shall be collected at the time of the issuance of the commitment with respect to the mortgage, with the balance of such charges or fees (whether the commitment was issued before or during such period) being collected at the time of purchase."

SEC. 10. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting immediately after "\$13,500" the following: "(or \$13,500 per dwelling unit in the case of a mortgage insured under section 213)".

SEC. 11. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "Provided, That" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Providing, That the Association may by regulation increase such amount by not more than \$1,000 in the case of mortgages covering property located in geographical areas where it finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further, That*";

(2) by inserting after "shall exceed \$1,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time" the following: ", which limit shall be increased by \$1,000,000,000 on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Association shall by regulation (1) allocate the assistance provided under this subsection in order to channel such assistance, to the maximum extent practicable, into geographic areas where the problems of excessive mortgage discounts and the shortage of mortgage credit are most severe, and (2) prevent any builder or mortgagee from obtaining a disproportionately large share of such assistance."

SEC. 12. Section 305 of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage (or participation therein) which is insured under section 203(1); but (1) the Association shall not enter into any commitment or make any purchase under this subsection unless the property involved was approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, and (2) the total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed \$50,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The Association shall not enter into any commitment or make any purchase involving a mortgage (or participation) insured under section 203(1), under this subsection or any other provision of this section, if any service charge (other than the normal origination fee charged to the mortgagor) was imposed or collected in connection with the making of the loan."

SEC. 13. (a) Section 305 of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof, after subsection (h) (as added by section 12 of this Act), the following new subsection:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage (or participation therein) which is insured under section 810; but the total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed \$25,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

(b) Section 305(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "title VIII of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 803 or 809 of this Act".

SEC. 14. With respect to any mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration or any loan guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration, where the commitment of the Federal Housing Administration or the certificate of reasonable value of the Veterans' Administration was issued more than sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the originating mortgagee shall report to the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration, as the case may be, the amount of any fees, charges, or discounts (except for the normal origination fee charged to the mortgagor) paid by the builder, seller, broker, sponsor, or any other person in connection with or for the purpose of arranging the mortgage or loan.

SEC. 15. Section 404(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting

before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or which the Secretary determines to be a permanent part of the military establishment".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, strike out "the Association" in line 1 and all that follows down through the end of line 7, and insert the following: ", the Association may sell or otherwise dispose of any mortgage or participation therein only on a cash basis and only at a price which is not less than the acquisition price of such mortgage or participation (or the average of the acquisition prices when the transaction involves more than one mortgage), except that this clause shall not apply to assignments of mortgages or participations by the Association to the Federal Housing Administration".

Page 7, line 6, after "require" insert the following: ", and by such additional sum in the case of mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii as may be necessary (because of the higher costs there prevailing) to permit the purchase under this subsection of mortgages covering housing in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii which is comparable in construction and design to other housing covered by mortgages which may be purchased under this subsection".

Page 9, after line 24, add the following: "Sec. 16. Section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. For purposes of this subsection (1) the terms "Armed Forces", "one of the military departments of the United States", "military department", "Secretary or his designee", and "Secretary" when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and the term "Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force" when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate, (2) the terms "civilian employee", "civilians", and "civilian personnel" as used in this section shall be deemed to refer to employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, and (3) the terms "military installation" when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of such Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

MR. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by MR. BENTLEY: Page 7, line 24, strike out "and."

Page 8, insert "; and" after the quotation marks in line 8 and insert after line 8 the following:

"(4) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by paragraph (3) of this section) the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Association shall not purchase or make a commitment to purchase under this subsection any mortgage covering housing with respect to which there is (or is

permitted to be) any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.'"

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

MR. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the long-expected and awaited anti-discrimination amendment as it applies to section 11 of the pending legislation with respect to the additional billion dollars for FNMA's program and operation.

To anticipate any questions or impressions that may be in the mind of any Member I would like to say categorically here and now that if this amendment or similar amendments are adopted to the bill I will support the bill and I will vote for it.

Furthermore, I would like to say that I have been concerned for some time about this question of discrimination in the field of federally financed housing. Last year I introduced legislation which would have abolished discrimination with respect to the voluntary home mortgage credit program. This year on February 3 I introduced H.R. 10163 which would have provided that the Federal Government shall not extend any financial or other assistance for housing with respect to which there is or may be discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for other purposes.

My bill would have applied to the entire field of federally financed housing. I limited this particular amendment to section 11 because I was not sure that an amendment broader in scope would be germane at this particular time. But I do feel that where Federal officials or agencies are making loans or grants, or providing mortgage insurance for purchase or construction there should not be any such authorization where any racial or religious discrimination exists.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I would suggest to the members of the committee that some time, if they have not already done so, they turn to the national conference and the reports of the State advisory committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1959, and read the particular section with reference to their State insofar as housing is concerned. I would just like to read a paragraph or two from the section dealing with my own State of Michigan:

From examples given by the reports from Michigan cities, it is evident that in general the programs of the Public Housing Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Urban Renewal Administration, while importantly relieving the national housing shortage, are contributing to the spread and intensification of housing segregation, as is seen from the following:

The mortgage insurance program of FHA is utilized by almost all private builders who practice racial and religious discrimination in housing development and mass-produced projects, and by members of the housing industry in financing relocation housing for families displaced by Government activities.

Then the State of Michigan Advisory Committee goes on to make the following recommendations:

That is the extension of all Federal housing aids be only on condition of a guarantee that the accommodations be available to all



qualified persons under the same terms and conditions without regard to race or color—

A situation which certainly does not exist in my State at this particular time.

In offering this antidiscrimination amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am not pointing my finger at any particular geographical area of our country. In Michigan, of course, we do not have any problems of discrimination with respect to the question of voting on which we recently passed legislation in this House. I would say, however, that discrimination with respect to employment and particularly in the field of housing can be found in almost any part of the United States.

In the case of privately financed housing, I do not believe that this is the appropriate time to deal with that matter. Most States have legislation or could enact legislation to take care of that situation.

I say with the utmost sincerity of which I am capable that as long as it is the policy of the administration and the Congress to act to remove discrimination based on racial or religious lines and as long as Federal money is going into any part of the housing program, I think all discrimination of any kind in federally financed housing programs should be outlawed, and I believe the Congress should take the necessary action.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am not going to use the full time allotted me because everyone knows what this amendment means. It is simply the same attempt that was made last year on the housing bill to scuttle it completely. This is in line with the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio discussed in debate on the rule yesterday.

I have only this further to say, that this type of amendment if adopted, as everyone who is interested in housing will know, kills the bill. It is a parliamentary maneuver in order to get the bill into a position so it can be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the gentleman from Alabama is not questioning my personal motives in offering this amendment. I have offered this amendment in all sincerity. I am not presuming to speak of the motives of any other Member of the body, but I assure the gentleman from Alabama that my motive in offering this amendment comes from a sincere desire to improve the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Alabama referred to certain actions here in the last session on the housing bill. If my recollection serves me correctly,

and I think it does, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] offered a similar amendment to the Herlong substitute. At that time it was indicated that if the substitute did not prevail the same amendment would be offered to the committee bill.

The substitute did not prevail. In spite of the fact we were supporting it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] received very substantial support on the Democratic side, but when the time came for consideration of the committee amendment, no such amendment was offered to the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I merely want to correct the distinguished minority leader's recollection.

His memory is incorrect about what happened on the housing bill last year. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] and was not offered by the gentleman from New York and was defeated overwhelmingly by the votes on this side, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] himself, so he is totally in error about it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Alabama is correct in respect to the offering of the amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]. That had slipped my mind, and I accept that correction. But the amendment came from this side and not from that side on the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this point: I appreciate there are some motives on possibly both sides of the aisle that have nothing to do with the issue. The issue, if you please, as the gentleman from Michigan has posed it, is "Do we have a problem of racial discrimination in our Federal Housing Administration? Does it exist in my State of Missouri? Yes; indeed it does. I have talked to Negro leaders, and they tell me that one of the great problems today is the problem of racial discrimination in housing. I am convinced that that is an important issue.

Now, whether or not the issue is presented to this Congress in relation to a bill so that it might be defeated, if that issue itself is important that is the test, the other has no bearing. Whether we vote up or down this particular amendment must be decided on the basis of whether or not we believe that it is an important problem at the Federal level; that there is a problem of racial dis-

crimination in the way Federal funds are being used in the housing field. I am convinced that that is the case. In fact, I am surprised that this committee came out with this bill without a provision of this nature already in the bill so that it would not have to be offered on the floor of the House.

I want to say this: I voted for every Powell amendment, or one like it, that has been proposed in relation to these Federal expenditure bills, in relation to school construction or whatever, and I will continue to do so, although I do recognize that there is a fair charge made that the motives of some who support that are to defeat the bill. The question does come back not to whether or not this will defeat a housing bill. The question comes back: Do we have racial discrimination in this area, and do we mean what we said we meant when we debated for those long weeks the civil rights bill? Do we really believe that at the Federal level we should do everything we can to eliminate this discrimination?

Mr. Chairman, I engaged in correspondence with the head of the NAACP and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], on this very subject, raising a question about their approach to this amendment when their supporters actually went through the line with my good friends from the Southern States in voting down these amendments on the ground, as they say, that it was put in in order to defeat the bill. I said maybe that was the motive of many people, but should that take one's mind off of the real problem? Is not the problem and must not the problem be this question of civil rights in relation to racial discrimination, and if that is so, let us meet it and let us meet it just as we met the civil rights bill. Do you people on that side of the aisle—and I am now addressing myself to what I hope will be the northern Democrat-Republican coalition, as it always has been on civil rights—do you people really believe enough in civil rights that you are willing to join the Republicans and put it in measures of this nature? I have heard on the floor of the House this old thing that is brought in each time that there is a southern Democrat-Republican coalition in which, I have said, we do get together and hope it will continue on fiscal matters.

The essential coalition, as I stated back in January, is the northern Democratic-southern Democratic coalition. You call yourselves a political party. You are the ones who elect the Speaker, who elect your majority leader; you elect the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, in effect, the head of the Committee on Rules. In effect you elect the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of your Committee on the Judiciary. Are you going now to measure up to national responsibility on this issue?

I know that some of you want this housing bill, but this is an important thing. You are answering two questions in your vote. No. 1, do you think there is a real problem in this housing situation as far as racial discrimination is

concerned? If your answer is "Yes," that there is a problem, then indeed I see no other course but that you vote for this amendment so that we will correct the situation this time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. In order that I might be properly apprized in responding to the allegation or inquiry made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, I would like to know whether or not he is basing his argument on the theory that the present administration, in the operations of its executive agency, is now improperly discriminating in housing in this country, although there is no such authority contained in the law?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there is discrimination, yes. I think this administration can be properly criticized on that. But this is a matter, I might say, for the Congress to decide. Are we going to approve what discrimination there is? We know this is a serious problem. There are people in the administration who are fighting to eliminate this discrimination, just as there are people in this administration who take the other point of view. It is now before the Congress as to whether or not we want to back up those in the administration who are trying to eliminate racial discrimination or whether we want to take this attitude of all things to all people here.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman admit that the problem can be resolved right now, immediately, by a directive from the head of the agency?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe that it can be.

Mr. FASCELL. Administratively?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe it can be entirely, particularly as this does relate to the Congress. I believe a great deal more can be done and I hope it will continue to be done. But the issue is before us now and what we do on this will have a great bearing on what the administration does.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to this question that has been raised on determining whether there is racial discrimination at the administrative level, there is no intentional racial discrimination, but the discrimination, where it exists, originates with the subdivider, the man who builds the houses, the salespeople who offer them. There is discrimination even in the matter of showing the houses to people of various races, religions, and creeds. The Administration would have to have a tremendous police force to be sure that each builder, each salesman, was not denying to certain racial groups this opportunity. So the Administration is not at fault in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised at the attitude taken by my colleague on the Democratic side the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] concerning this amendment. We spent a lot of time debating this bill yesterday. The burden of the argument was entirely directed to the point of aiding the low wage group to obtain housing. Here is an amendment that would assure many people in the low wage group the benefits of this bill, because under this amendment there would be no discrimination because of race, religion, ancestry, or national origin, and it is being opposed. I do not know how many of the Members who are here today were here yesterday when we discussed the heart of this bill. The pertinent part of it is that \$1 billion will be made available to FNMA to purchase at par any mortgage from \$13,500 to \$14,500 in high-cost areas. That gives the builder, the homebuilder the full advantage of cashing in at par, but there is nothing in the bill, and there is no assurance in this legislation that the home buyer is going to profit by the discount that the homebuilder picks up by selling his mortgage at par to FNMA. How can it then become a small wage earner, low-income group bill? Furthermore, if denial is made of this amendment—and the charge is made that it is not offered in good faith, with which charge I cannot agree—if this amendment is denied we are saying in effect that we do not want the small wage earners in these categories to benefit from this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BENTLEY and Mr. RAINS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, yeas 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINS: On page 10, strike out section 15 beginning on line 7 and ending on line 11 and redesignate any succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which strikes out the section known as the Wherry acquisition section. It is the section that said the military would be required to purchase all Wherry housing at all permanent military bases. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has now a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] which is engaged in working out the

details of these Wherry transfers. For that reason, I ask that this amendment be adopted to exclude the Wherry acquisition section from the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and I rise in support of the bill. It would seem to me that the logical way to determine whether one would support this bill would be to arrive at the facts.

First, on the question of need, the majority of the committee makes a strong case in support of this legislation; yet in debate on this floor, as usual, we have heard the majority position attacked on several grounds: That the facts are untrue, that the motives of the proponents are political, and finally that the legislation is fiscally irresponsible.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee who is the author of this legislation, present basic facts to this committee. More importantly, Mr. Chairman, he requested that any person who could successfully challenge those basic facts, should immediately do so. To this point in the record of the debate on this bill, there is not a successful challenge to the basic facts. It is easy to rationalize one's own political position and draw entirely different conclusions from the facts, but it seems to me that in all fairness, such a position should be so stated.

In Dade County, Fla., one of the fastest growing areas in the country, construction is one of our principal economic factors, just as construction throughout the country must now be considered basic to the economy of the United States. It certainly must be included along with other major industries, such as the automobile industry, steel, agriculture, and the production of consumer goods.

For some time now, many people in our area have been very much concerned about the programed effort of the present administration to restrict credit, raise interest rates, and slow down home construction. Perhaps one or all of these actions must necessarily be applied at a particular time under certain economic conditions. At the same time, however, it must likewise be admitted that there is and can be a time when such restrictions need to be eased.

The facts are that in my area, for some time, the restrictions applied have been too stringent. Financing is difficult to obtain, interest rates have climbed sharply, discounting has increased, unfavorable secondary financing arrangements are resorted to, money is scarce and building generally has slowed down.

I am confident that while I generalize on these subjects, that a technical survey of my area would more than substantiate these facts.

The committee has outlined some of them for the State of Florida in its report. I would like to quote two, and I am sure I could get many more communications, which point out the seriousness of the situation we have in south Florida.



The following telegram was received by me on January 26:

MIAMI, FLA., January 26, 1960.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,  
House of Representatives Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

This company active in south Florida home finance field more than 5 years. Figures from our records show massive decrease in construction and home sales industry.

October 1959 decrease of 34 percent compared with October 1958.

November decrease of 72 percent compared with November 1958.

December 1959 decrease of 53 percent compared with December 1958.

We face extended bleak future with current construction loans total 34 percent less than 1 year ago and cost of construction money up more than 100 percent. This widespread slackening of business in home-building industry is a reflection of public concern as to high interest rates, large discounts, and Federal Reserve activity. We urge support of immediate housing measures to give relief and public confidence to VA and FHA programs as well as stability to the money market.

HOME MORTGAGE CO. OF FLORIDA,  
By W. M. MOORE, Vice President.

The following letter was received by me on February 4:

It is naturally disturbing to see our great industry experiencing such extreme financial pressure, due to the high mortgage discounts demanded by the lending institutions.

At this time I am most anxious to see us actively support this proposed legislation in every manner possible. It should be clearly understood and publicly pointed out that this special assistance program is a contingent liability and will not be in any way a cost to the taxpayers. These funds are repaid, and become completely self-sustaining.

The existing situation, and obvious truth, is that the VA and FHA home purchasers are paying the unrealistic mortgage discounts in the price of the house they purchase.

Permit me to thank you in advance for any additional consideration you may feel this matter justifies.

MORTON ADLER,  
Home Builder.

The facts pointed out by these two communications are readily visible to anyone who is in any way acquainted with construction in our area in the last few years.

A great to-do is made by some of our distinguished colleagues here today about the fact that this bill represents a raid on the Treasury of the United States through a back-door approach. As a matter of fact, the legislation is quite clear. It would authorize and by our action here we do so, the expenditure of funds for the purpose expressed in the legislation. I see nothing secretive about this. Congress is acting as a responsible body, to determine whether it will or will not grant this authorization. I have no difficulty in deciding on the facts. I am willing as a Congressman to grant this particular authorization at this time to an executive department, for the purpose of the legislation.

It is likewise contended with great anguish today that even if there is a need, and disregarding what the op-

ponents allege is an improper method of authorization, the billion-dollar authorization which is part of this legislation, should not be passed at this time because; first, the national debt of the United States is higher than it has ever been; second, it will unbalance the budget; third, it will result in deficit spending; fourth, it is fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to overlook the nature of these cries and also overlook the fact that this happens to be the principal type of issue which is being manufactured for public consumption in a presidential election year. The objections enumerated fall flatter than a pancake without self-rising flour, because I am perfectly willing to vote the billion dollars for this important purpose and vote to cut a billion dollars from other places in the President's budget that I know can be cut and will be cut by this Congress. Furthermore, if we do not do this and it becomes necessary, I am perfectly willing to support the tax measure which will provide the financing for this important program.

I would simply ask those who oppose this bill why they do not feel that way? Everyone knows, Mr. Chairman, the necessary financing adjustments within the budget can be made to cover this authorization, if necessary. The point is, do you really want to do it? I say, based on the facts presented by the majority of the committee which are incontroverted and which I feel are more than substantially supported by the actual conditions in my own area, I find no hesitancy in supporting this legislation. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and his committee for bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it should not be overlooked that while this legislation authorizing the executive agency to expend up to a billion dollars by calling on the Treasury of the United States for that purpose, the executive agency is buying on the market mortgages from home owners of the United States, and that those mortgages are being repaid promptly and properly. I have heard no facts from any of the opponents to this legislation which would indicate that there is any reasonable doubt in anyone's mind that economic conditions will continue to be such that this good repayment record will continue. As a matter of fact, the opponents allege that economic conditions are good, and that there is peace and prosperity. The fact is that there is little likelihood, and we all know it, that the Government will lose any money because of this contingent liability.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Alabama, I would like to take this time to ask a couple of questions. Yesterday, as one of the reasons for this bill, the gentleman said:

The bill is intended to help reduce the exorbitant and unconscionable discounts

prevalent throughout the Nation on home loan mortgages.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman point to any section of the bill that governs in any way the discounts charged by the mortgagors?

Mr. RAINS. The par purchase section and the special assistance funds controls it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just a moment.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman want me to answer his question?

Mr. YOUNGER. I know, but you say that the purchase of mortgages at par controls the discounts of the mortgagors.

Mr. RAINS. You did not let me finish.

Mr. YOUNGER. All right.

Mr. RAINS. The other control is this. One of the reasons that high discounts are now chargeable is the lack of competition, and the whole bill and that section of the bill having to do with the billion dollar Fannie Mae authorization will help to alleviate the shortage and the high cost of money at the present time. It did it in 1958. It did it before and it will do it again.

Mr. YOUNGER. But there is nothing in the bill that in any way controls the discount that the mortgagor charges.

Mr. RAINS. I heard the gentleman say yesterday that he had been in this business for a long time. I have, too, as a matter of fact. But I am not one of those who think you can write into a bill a statement that says discounts cannot be above a certain figure. We recognize that there has to be some flexibility. I am not totally uninformed on that, I will assure the gentleman. But I know the answer to it is not in writing in definite language with a specific prohibition. Instead, you must make available at least a modicum of a reasonable supply of mortgage credit in order to keep discounts within reasonable proportions.

Mr. YOUNGER. But this does not cover discounts at all. The gentleman well knows that if your experience is what you say it is, and in that respect we have common experience, that will not control the discount any more than it controlled it in the Veterans' Administration loans.

Mr. RAINS. It has done it in the past. That is the only answer I can make.

Mr. YOUNGER. It has not controlled it in the past.

Now, one other question. In this bill you give the Administrator the right to reduce the premium from one-half to one-quarter percent. That control has always been by the Congress.

Mr. RAINS. It has always been discretionary to a certain point.

Mr. YOUNGER. No. The premium for the insurance is not discretionary.

Mr. RAINS. It is now discretionary from one-half to 1 percent. Do you not trust the Administrator?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am asking you. You are putting the power in the Administrator to take over the power that the Congress has controlled; yet you will not take the Administrator's word

for one recommendation in regard to this bill in the operation. The Administrator just last night said he was opposed to this bill and every section of the bill.

Mr. RAINS. I would assume that he is, but I would be willing for him to judge whether or not, when there is a big surplus in his agency, it ought to be lowered. That is his responsibility and we expect him to live up to it.

Mr. YOUNGER. He will not know if there is enough to cover the guarantee. The FHA has never been tested since it was started in 1934. You have had a constant increase in the price of real estate and homes. Nobody knows what it will take. You will give to the Administrator the right to make a present to somebody, which rates have always been controlled by Congress, yet in this bill you will not take one recommendation from him.

Mr. RAINS. Yes; I will take the Administrator's word when he says he thinks he can lower it. I do not take his advice as to policy.

Mr. YOUNGER. When it happens to differ with your opinion you will not take it.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. But is the Administrator's word to be taken in regard to operation?

Mr. RAINS. Yes; as to administrative details.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This bill does nothing for the home buyer. It gives a clear profit to the home builder. Is that not the point you are trying to make?

Mr. YOUNGER. No. It gives an unnecessary bonus to the lender. It gives him the right to go out and lend at any discount he wants to and turn the mortgage over to the buyer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to end this debate and get back to the alleged purpose of this legislation. We had a very tragic picture painted by the sponsor yesterday of gloom and doom with respect to the United States, of a recession that he claimed was in the offing.

Let me read from last night's Washington Evening Star an article by Sylvia Porter:

#### JOBLESSNESS HAS PLUNGED THIS MONTH

The number of jobless in our Nation again has dropped below the 4 million mark—wiping out the startlingly steep upswing which occurred in unemployment during March's dreadful weather.

The percentage of our labor force seeking jobs but unable to find them has fallen to less than 5 percent—reducing the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate to around the 4.8 percent of February.

Employment on farms, on construction projects, in plants and stores has climbed by hundreds of thousands in the past few weeks—pushing employment back into the seasonal uptrend usual at this time of any good business year.

These figures will not be released for another two weeks. The United States Labor

Department's report on employment-unemployment in April is not scheduled until the second week of May.

But the census on which the May report will be based was taken in the week of April 10 through 16. Enough material is in the hands of Government experts to permit an informed forecast about April's developments.

This morning's New York Times, on the financial page, has the heading "Orders Climb for Machine Tools," and makes the statement:

A rise in orders for machine tools last month raised the level for the first quarter of this year to the highest point since the 1957 period. Machine tool orders are an important indicator of industrial planning.

And the same page contains the following headlines: "Earnings of General Motors Climb to Record"; "Sales Also at a Peak"—incidentally, an alltime peak for the first quarter—"Cigarette Maker Sets Profit Peak"; "Gimbel's Earnings Soar 23.1 Percent as Sales Surge to Record Level"; "Babcock and Wilcox Records Peak Net"; "U.S. Exports Zoomed in March."

I would like to close by reading from a New York Times editorial I inserted in the RECORD yesterday. There are many who class themselves as northern liberals who read the New York Times as though it were the Bible. Let me read from an editorial from the New York Times of February 13, 1960:

So far as the state of the economy is concerned, it is such as to indicate that the proposal to blow up mortgage demand artificially would not only be potentially inflationary on the demand side (for residential building has an exceptionally high multiplier effect on municipal and private spending) but it would lop off at a stroke nearly one-fourth the hoped-for surplus in the 1961 Federal budget. As to the lack of funds available for residential mortgages, this is true only if one believes that the Nation has a responsibility to maintain the supply of such funds at all times at a figure equal to or exceeding the recent previous high.

This is a very strong editorial against the bill you are trying to enact at this time.

I urge all of you to defeat this legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, considerable discussion during this debate was devoted to the difficulty of veterans participating in the housing legislation. The following letter from A. Kobe, of Gary, Ind., explains in detail the veteran's problem under the present housing legislation:

GARY, IND., April 23, 1960.

HON. RAY MADDEN,  
U.S. Congressman,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: It certainly was a privilege to have the pleasure of meeting you in your office last Friday morning. I realize that you are a very busy man and I am very grateful to you for the time you have given me concerning the problem we discussed.

I did have a conference with Mr. Dervan, assistant to Mr. P. N. Brownstein, Director of Loan Guarantee Service, Veterans' Administration. At that time, I did air my particular problem to them and they did assure me that they would review my case and try to come

up with a decision of some sort the week of April 25. You have, no doubt, heard from him as he did assure me that he was going to call you and discuss the problem with you. To me, it did appear that there was very little encouragement, and I am very doubtful whether anything can be done to help the situation that I am faced with at the present time.

I wish to call your attention to a particular problem which a veteran is faced with when he applies for Veterans' Administration assistance for a loan. A builder is confronted with a commission to be paid to the lender of the money, that must be absorbed in the profits of the sale of a home. This is utterly fantastic and almost an impossibility for a builder to absorb. Commissions for loans today amount to 10 to 20 points. In our particular instance, it amounts to an average of almost \$1,700 per house. In some areas it amounts to almost twice that amount. A large project home builder, who builds upwards from 300 homes a year, could possibly pay this type of commission to a lending institution; but my experience with this type of situation has been one where the commission is included in the cost of a home and passed on to the veteran who buys the home, but as I stated to you in your office, we are a small builder. We are faced with a higher cost for land which is perfectly justifiable. The land is very desirable, it has all the protection and conveniences of the city and the site is very ideally located and cannot be surpassed for any reason. Therefore, land of this type has a higher valuation it its owners. Coupled with this fact plus commissions to be paid to a lending institution for mortgage money, it has placed our demands for an appraisal from the Veterans' Administration about \$700 to \$800 beyond what they feel is a satisfactory appraisal for this type of home. We have given them comparables for similar homes within the same area that we are working in, and proved to them that the land values are at least \$10 a front foot more than we are getting, plus a better appraisal on the structure. Within the confines of the loan, I am sure the Veterans' Administration can approve our demands without any reasons of doubt. We can and we will, absorb a portion of the commission needed to secure mortgage money. As we mentioned to you, our profit was very slim. We cannot absorb any more than what we feel would give us a very ethical profit. To arrive at a profit that is fair, we must have exactly what we have asked for from the Administration. I expect to have an answer from Mr. Dervan within a week. If he finds it impossible to give us a favorable answer, it will necessitate another trip to his office to discuss the matter further.

It is my understanding that Congress is now investigating the future of the veterans' program regarding the homebuilding program. I want to go on record as a veteran, asking that you very diligently pursue the problems that we veterans are faced with concerning the homebuilding program. I feel, and I think that everyone in the Veterans' Administration will agree, that there must be some legislation to correct the lack of interest of lending institutions to be attracted to loaning money on the veterans' program. When moneys are available for veterans' loans, the commissions that are paid to lenders make it prohibitive for builders to absorb. Therefore, the problem has created a very chaotic condition which the veteran will be held responsible for because they are buying the same home for \$2,000 to \$3,000 more with conventional mortgage money. Builders are almost snubbing the veterans' loan completely, because of a lack of interest of a lending institution to provide the necessary money, without a commission. I am at a loss to know why there is such a tremendous amount of money



available in some areas, and not ours, on a conventional mortgage basis. It is my understanding that in some localities, loans are available for 19 percent commission, along with the purchaser being faced with two and three junior mortgages on a home. If you will recall, and I believe you will, this is a situation that existed prior to the financial disaster in 1929. Veterans are desperate and they are in need of housing. I think the veterans' program was well instigated and properly protected by law at the time it was formed. I do not feel that adequate changes have come about to continue to make the veterans' program adaptable to the present conditions. Our problems can be quite simply solved by permitting the law to be changed and raising the interest rate on a veteran's loan to satisfy the lending institution. To have the veteran bypass the protection of the Veterans' Administration and buy homes on a conventional basis, he is not only faced with a higher cost home which is way beyond the fair appraisal of the Veterans' Administration, but he is also faced with the problem of very inferior construction because we do not have the support of the proper inspections that are needed to conform with the architectural demands and specifications of the Veterans' Administration.

Again I ask that you encourage your colleagues to renew the veterans' program to World War II and any following military engagements. With simple modifications and changes in the law as it now exists, I am sure that we can satisfy every one concerned and it will also produce a very sound and lasting program and it will also be a buffer to any inflationary moves that are definitely heading in that way now. It is my intention to rally as many other builders with me in trying to encourage our Congressmen to have this program continue on as it has so successfully in the past years. It has produced very fine results in the past and there is no reason why it cannot continue to do so.

Again I wish to thank you for your time you have given me in counseling the moves to be made in helping me in my problem. I am certain with your cooperation, we are going to be able to correct the problem as it now exists.

Any time that you are in Lake County, feel free to call me at your convenience. I would be most delighted to visit with you and perhaps we could arrange a meeting with our friend, Mr. Mandich.

I shall be looking forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

A. KOBE.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be discussing whether or not an additional Government subsidy is going to be injected into the mortgage market to stimulate the purchase of homes—an additional \$1 billion. Rather, we should be looking sharply at another situation which can siphon off many millions of the available dollars from the mortgage market. I certainly do not feel that H.R. 10213 would work for the long-run interest of homebuilding calling as it does for additional Government subsidies.

What we must do is channel the flow of true savings into the mortgage market. If we do not, we only add to the troubles that have been all too prevalent in the past for housing—inflationary pressures, increase in construction costs, and the pricing of more and more Americans, principally those in the lower income brackets, out of the housing market.

Now, Mr. Chairman, savings alone do not automatically stimulate home buying. The money market is a complex mechanism—and it must function efficiently and smoothly if the required amount of savings is to flow into mortgages. We are today in the 11th month of a dammed-up flow caused by the unwillingness of a majority in this Congress to take a simple, direct, and businesslike step. I refer to the Congress' refusal to remove the outmoded 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

To my mind this is the most serious block in the channeling of a sustained and increasing flow of money into the mortgage market which could have vastly benefited American housing during the past year. Instead, it has caused distortions in the credit market and a confused pattern of blame being erroneously cast on those who would in the language of the critics insist on higher and higher interest rates.

These critics are wishful thinkers, too, because they have said that the recent decline in interest rates solved the problem of removing the outmoded ceiling and that the Treasury could from now on sell long-term bonds within the limit of the current ceiling. Have they not read the message clearly—the firm rejection by investors of the single 4¼-percent, 25-year bond offered by the Treasury on April 4.

The Treasury was courageous and logical in offering up to \$1½ billion worth of this bond in order to test the situation as it is today. It had no other way to judge the true demand for long-term bonds in the credit market—and the market's answer was loud and clear. These new bonds were just not attractive to investors. The strength of our economy today has resulted in much better investment opportunities from which to choose. As you know, there were only \$370 million of the bonds purchased after the announcement.

Now comes the question in relation to this bill H.R. 10213. How has the existence on maintaining the 4¼-percent ceiling hurt the mortgage market? This is what has happened: The Treasury has been forced to confine its financing to less than 5-year securities. This has distorted the credit mechanism and has certainly pushed short-term rates to excessively high peaks. You will recall the "magic 5s" of last October. This was an instance where the Treasury had to go to a 5-percent note in order to get its money to pay the Government's bills. Naturally, individuals with funds in savings banks, savings and loan associations, and savings departments of commercial banks were highly attracted by this rate because, remember, it was in sharp contrast to the 3 to 4½ percent prevalent in those institutions. What happened was not hard to predict. They withdrew hundreds of millions of dollars from these savings institutions and thereby siphoned off an important amount from a source, ordinarily a principal one, available to the mortgage market.

These funds and others during this period of high short-term interest rates

are funds that ordinarily would have gone into the mortgage market and hence into the promotion of needed homebuilding. In addition, many of the financial institutions feared more issues of this type to come in the future and they in turn became reluctant to engage in future commitments to buy mortgages.

Experienced people in the market have said that the recent decline in housing starts can to a large extent be traced to the impact on the mortgage market of the restrictions imposed by the interest-rate ceiling last autumn.

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Homebuilders, through its president on March 11 of this year, wrote a letter to his membership strongly urging support of another bill, H.R. 10590. This, as you know, does not remove the ceiling but would furnish valuable flexibility to the Treasury and permit it to avoid excessive drafts on the short-term market. The leaders of the homebuilders themselves realize that this is not an exercise in economic or financial theories, but that the existence of the roadblock of the outmoded ceiling can do nothing but continue to hurt homebuilding. This view is also shared by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to realize that our free economy has to really be free of old-fashioned, outmoded and unfair restrictions on the dynamic ability of the American economy to respond healthily and in normal fashion to the flow of its free markets. We have a growing economy and we live in prosperous times but, believe me, we are doing the wrong thing when we attempt by arbitrary measures to make anything, including money, cheaper than the economy permits or which is necessary to its continued progress. If we don't heed such advice, we get into conditions like this where the Treasury, in attempting to live with an outmoded restriction, has to go into an area of the money market which pulls large amounts of needed funds out of the mortgage market. If we want to do something for homebuilding, let us get at the source and face up to the facts. Homebuilding cannot live up to the promise which every American feels personally as long as we have an artificial restriction of such magnitude on the management of the national debt which results in a distortion of the credit market where the needs and the demands for credit are strong and growing. Let us remove this 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling right away.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are seeing here today a demonstration of panic-button legislation. This is an old legislative device. Cry loudly, articulately, and often that disaster is about to befall the Nation and vote sensitive Members of this House respond by stampeding in all directions to destroy the national structure with hoses and axes to put out a fire that does not exist. In the case of this legislation, the cynical lack of concern by the big spenders here is exposed.

This is termed an emergency bill to deal with a so-called emergency situation in the Nation's housing industry and to deal with supposed emergency conditions affecting our people whose housing plight is said to have reached emergency proportions. We are taking a wild semantic toboggan ride. It is high time that we behave like responsible legislators and look at the situation we are facing without the hysteria of doom. We will not answer this or any other issue with pitchmen's spiels and ill-considered cure-alls in this election year. We must look at what the so-called emergency is, what the so-called palliative costs, and how many people would obtain genuine benefit from it.

Upon careful evaluation, it appears that the application of the term emergency to this bill is entirely inappropriate. We apparently will see a slight decline in new housing starts this year after the boom conditions that prevailed in 1959. Even with the decline the prospects are for a banner year of new starts and an actual increase in the dollar volume of new housing of more than 10 percent over any year before 1959.

We have here a bill which urges a billion-dollar raid of the Treasury for the purchase of mortgages at subsidy prices. This is planned in the back door tradition which is becoming the classical plan of those who want to spew out our tax dollars without the courage of presenting the people the price tag.

The Federal Government is complicated and costly enough without adding any more of this kind of phony slight-of-hand financing. If we are ever to see a tax reduction in this country, we are going to have to save our costly emergency legislation for genuine emergency situations. This is not an emergency and let us have the courage to say so.

The bill before the house does not help the struggling family with inadequate housing. This bill is directed to subsidizing housing merchants for whom no tears need be shed. They can fend for themselves.

The emergency that needs attention today is in the purchasing power of our dollar. By the time Congress passes all the pet spending programs that are on the legislative assembly lines, the families with inadequate housing will find their meager dollars will buy less food, clothing, and housing than before, while the builders and brokers who find favors in this bill will be living high on the hog.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. I am addressing myself now to the amendment to strike out section 15 of the bill which provides for the buying of Wherry housing. The gentleman knows, of course, that I have been interested in this particular amendment for some time. If my memory serves me correctly, a similar provision was in the housing bill of last year and the same objection was raised then that is raised now, that the Armed Services Committee was going to prepare some legislation to take care of it. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. Just 1 minute, I would like a reply from the gentleman from Alabama first.

Mr. RAINS. The Wherry housing has been in the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, for some time. The original formula was written 6, 7, or 8 years ago. The gentleman will recall that last year the section requiring the purchase of Wherry housing on a permanent basis was included, and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia set up a committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who said they would speed action on the purchase of Wherry housing. It is my information that they did that; they held hearings and that there are only a few projects still left. I got this in conversation with the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas. On the basis that they were to get the matter cleaned up I asked that it be excluded at this time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now 12 months have intervened. I would like to ask the gentleman, can he give me any information or any encouragement to believe that this legislation is going to come up soon or at this session or is it in the foreseeable future that it will come up?

Mr. RAINS. My opinion is that the committee and the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Forces, can speak better than I on that. It is my information that they expect to attain the goal the gentleman seeks without any further explanation because there is on the books Wherry housing legislation. I would rather the gentleman address the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will furnish the gentleman the information that approximately 63,000 units have already been acquired by the Department of Defense and unless there is some military need on the part of the Department of Defense between now and June 5—I think that is the date—they will acquire about 16,000. During this year we will require 3,000 more. We are proceeding in an orderly manner. All of us have the same objective but we do not want any mandatory requirement that each and every unit must be acquired unless there is some military necessity or need for the units.

Mr. FORRESTER. Then, as I understand it, the gentleman was in error that he intended to offer legislation.

Mr. VINSON. If it becomes necessary to offer legislation, it will be offered, but we think we can accomplish the objective without legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. What the gentleman intends to do is buy what you want and let the others alone.

Mr. VINSON. We now have military use for it, and I am not going to advocate buying a unit that we have no military justification for. May I say that if the House goes along with us I am con-

fident we will take care of the units in a very short period of time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman just when will he get this legislation on these particular items?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot say it will be on the fifth of this month, or the fifth of next month, but we are approaching it in an orderly manner.

Mr. FORRESTER. Will the gentleman say during this session? When the gentleman simply says "orderly manner" I am a little bit afraid of that.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot hear the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am a little afraid of that "orderly manner." Will you do it during this term?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot make any promise like that. We will proceed as we should proceed, and we will not permit the Government to buy those for which there is no justification.

Mr. FORRESTER. Am I to understand there will be no legislation, then?

Mr. VINSON. If there is justification, all right; if there is no justification, we will not.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I observe that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is proceeding with deliberate speed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not think there is much doubt about the deliberation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Alabama a question. We have had a little argument over on this side on the proposition of whether or not an original lender under the terms of this bill can discount a mortgage, say 5 to 10 points, and then sell it to FNMA at par? I have said they cannot.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman is correct; they cannot. I am glad he asked that question because I would like to have the legislative history in the Record make it clear that they cannot.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would do that, because if a lender could do that I would vote against the bill even though I intend to vote for it.

Mr. RAINS. I assure the gentleman I would, too, but it is not the intention of the legislation that that would prevail. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question. These loans would be at par and FNMA would never permit the lender to charge a discount on loans it purchases at par. We certainly would never permit it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman please point to any part of the bill that prohibits that?

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman should put his finger on the part that permits it. We did not need to spell out the obvious.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman said he wrote the bill and knows about it. I did not write the bill.



Mr. RAINS. I did not say I wrote the bill. Our committee wrote the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, you did, yesterday.

Mr. RAINS. I will simply say this: The answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Washington is "No; they cannot do it."

Mr. YOUNGER. Why did you not put in the bill that the mortgagor could not sell a loan to FNMA at a price different from what he took it at? Why did you not express it in the bill? What you say here does not mean anything.

Mr. RAINS. I have answered the question.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman cannot point to one word in there that results in a prohibition against this practice.

Mr. RAINS. I can only repeat that FNMA would not permit it, nor would the Congress.

Mr. YOUNGER. Then it says "shall purchase any mortgage described in this subsection which is offered to it unless the loan is in default or in imminent danger of default or title to the property is defective." There is nothing at all said about discounts.

Mr. RAINS. The section you are quoting does not deal with discounts at all.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is the gentleman from Alabama saying there never has been an occasion where a lender has made an original loan at a discount and then turned around and peddled it to FNMA at par?

Mr. RAINS. I do not know what any individual has done, but the agency itself has never accepted these types of discounts that are talked about here. I do not doubt that some individual somewhere perhaps has done it.

Mr. WESTLAND. We know a GI mortgage today is taking a discount of about 10 points. Now, it is my understanding that under this bill any GI mortgage that FNMA will buy must have been made at par before they will buy it; is that correct?

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one section of the bill that causes me concern and which I feel I must object to and that is section 15. This section would amend existing law so as to require the Department of Defense to acquire all Wherry projects located at or near an installation "which the Secretary determines to be a permanent part of the Military Establishment." The effect of this language is, of course, to require the acquisition of virtually all Wherry projects.

Now, I do not feel that this is the proper way to go about acquiring these Wherry projects. This language imposes an absolute requirement on the military departments to buy these projects whether they need them or not. I am as interested as the Banking and Currency Committee is in the acquisition of all Wherry housing projects for which the military departments have an actual requirement. I do not want the military departments, however, to ac-

quire any Wherry housing for which they have no earthly need.

Indicative of my strong interest in the matter of acquiring Wherry projects is the fact that some time ago, on March 14, 1960, I reappointed a special subcommittee to look into this very matter. There have been some intimations that the progress of the acquisition of Wherry projects has not been as rapid as it might be. The chairman of this Wherry Acquisition Subcommittee is the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. It is his intention to initiate hearings on this subject in the very near future in order to bring up to date the information which his subcommittee obtained last year during similar hearings. Mr. KILDAY's hearings of last year were highly productive and speeded up the acquisition of Wherry projects to a very considerable extent.

I might say that the bare statistics themselves indicate that the Wherry acquisition program is definitely progressing, although we might like it to go a little faster.

Now, listen to this:

As of April 1, 1960, the military departments had acquired 62,237 units of Wherry housing. An additional 1,031 units are in the process of acquisition at the present time and it is expected that prior to June 30, this year, an additional 3,253 units will be acquired. Further, prior to June 30, 1961, still another 3,202 units will be acquired for a grand total of 69,723 units.

This figure together with 4,319 units which are now in default or acquired by the Federal Housing Administration represents over 88 percent of the original Wherry total of 83,742 units.

Now, the proper way to take care of this matter of Wherry housing acquisition is to permit the subcommittee to get all of the facts and then follow the matter up to see that all of the projects for which there are a military use be acquired, and be acquired promptly.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Just so that my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] might know about orderly procedure in the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, and because we work so diligently, so long, and so hard, you should come over some day, and I assure you we do have orderly procedure.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I just want to say to the gentleman I do not think that a visit is necessary, having seen this demonstration on the floor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am going to make any impression on anybody by the statement I am going to make. Evidently your minds are all made up. But, I want to say this, that this is the most irresponsible piece of legislation that the Committee on Banking and Currency ever reported here for

action. It is totally unnecessary, and the admitted author of the bill, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, has admitted that there is nothing in the law that gives any protection to the Government as far as previously discounted mortgages are concerned or any protection to the home buyer that he is going to reap the profits that the homebuilder will obtain when he sells his mortgage to FNMA for par. Now, this is the bill you are going to vote upon, gentlemen. We had a lot of talk about this thing, and we have gone off into all sorts of avenues as to the economic status of the country. We have talked about automobile production, tool production, money in the bank, and what not.

This bill will build only 70,000 houses. The total number of mortgages sold to FNMA at \$13,500 or \$14,500, if the total number were used up, would mean 70,000 houses out of an estimated 1,200,000, for this year. That is not going to make very much impression on the 64 million people who are employed in this country who the author of the bill attempts to imply are going to benefit by this bill. As a matter of fact, I just wanted to impress upon you that you are voting for a very irresponsible piece of legislation that I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, am embarrassed to have to bring in here for action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 3

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week and for next week, if he can announce it at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of this bill there will be no further legislative program for the remainder of the week. Later on, when we are in the House, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday.

On Monday we shall take up the Consent Calendar. There will be two suspensions. First, H.R. 10548, the Helium Act of 1960; and second, H.R. 10596, payments to soldiers' homes veterans.

If there is time on Monday, there are three bills on which rules have been reported:

H.R. 6851, Bent's Old Fort Historic Site, Colo.;

H.R. 8226, Castillo De San Marcos National Monument lands, Florida; and S. 1358, Headquarters site, Mount Rainier National Park.

On Tuesday there will be the Private Calendar and the Department of Defense appropriation bill.

There are several primaries on Tuesday—Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and also the District of Columbia. Later on, when we are in the House, I shall ask the permission of the House that any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. I understand it is going to be exercised and if so, S. 722, the depressed areas bill, will

be called up on that day, under the rules relating to Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation at that point? If Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, that will mean that we would have to lay aside the Defense Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not he expects to ask permission to dispense with Calendar Wednesday next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I do not intend to make that request because I have been informed that the desire exists to exercise next Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make this observation for myself. The Defense Department appropriation bill is one of the most important bills we will have at this session of the Congress. To my mind, after it is taken up, it ought to be concluded. Of course, if objection is made, I can understand what the situation may be, except that possibly there might be a vote or two as to just what we ought to do about that feature of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that if any Member on either side told me he did not want Calendar Wednesday dispensed with, I would not put him in the position of having to object to a unanimous-consent request that it be dispensed with; in other words, I feel that then I should not make the request.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been informed that there is a desire for Calendar Wednesday to be exercised next week and, if so, I desire to give the House as much notice in advance as I can, which I am doing on this occasion, by notifying the House that the bill to be taken up if reached will be the depressed areas bill.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to make the observation that there are many of us who consider the depressed areas bill to be of great importance, and even if we lose a day in the consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill, that would not be very meaningful at the present time because that is an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1961, which does not become effective before July 1 of this year.

Mr. McCORMACK. In announcing the program I did not want to get into a colloquy with my friend from Indiana on that question, but the gentleman from Illinois has very well given the other side.

If any action parliamentarily is taken on Wednesday that stops the depressed areas bill from coming up, of course other than a motion to adjourn, then we continue with the Defense Department appropriation bill. If all of Wednesday is taken up in connection with the bill that might be called up on that day, to-wit, the depressed areas bill, if it is reached in the call of the committees, then on Thursday we continue with the Defense Department appropriation bill.

Following the disposition of that bill, if there is time available next week, we

will take up H.R. 11713, the authorization bill in relation to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I make the usual reservations that conference reports may be called up at any time and that any change or additions to the program will be announced later on as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Is there a conference report slated for action this afternoon?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there is a conference report coming up on the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I had understood that was coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people, pursuant to House Resolution 498, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDONOUGH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10213 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 7, line 24, strike out "and".

Page 8, insert "; and" after the quotation marks in line 8 and insert after line 8 the following:

"(4) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by paragraph (3) of this section) the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Association shall not purchase or make a commitment to purchase under this subsection any mortgage covering housing with respect to which there is (or is permitted to be) any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 235, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—139

Adair	Dorn, N.Y.	Minshall
Allen	Dwyer	Moore
Andersen	Fenton	Mumma
Minn.	Fino	Nelsen
Arends	Ford	Norblad
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
Avery	Fulton	Osmer
Ayres	Gilbert	Ostertag
Baldwin	Glenn	Pillion
Barr	Goodell	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Griffin	Quie
Bates	Gross	Ray
Baumhart	Gubser	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Halpern	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Healey	Rogers, Mass.
Bentley	Henderson	Roosevelt
Berry	Hess	St. George
Betts	Hiestand	Santangelo
Bolton	Hoever	Saylor
Bosch	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwengel
Bray	Holt	Short
Broomfield	Holtzman	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Hosmer	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Stratton
Canhill	Johansen	Taber
Canfield	Judd	Teague, Calif.
Cannon	Kearns	Teller
Cederberg	Keith	Thomson, Wyo.
Celler	Knox	Tollefson
Chamberlain	Kyl	Vanik
Chenoweth	Laird	Van Pelt
Chiperfield	Langen	Van Zandt
Church	Latta	Wainwright
Collier	Lindsay	Wallhauser
Conte	Lipscomb	Weaver
Corbett	McCulloch	Weis
Cunningham	McDonough	Westland
Curtin	Mack, Ill.	Wharton
Curtis, Mass.	Mailliard	Widnall
Curtis, Mo.	May	Wilson
Dague	Meader	Withrow
Derounian	Morrow	Younger
Derwinski	Michel	Zelenko
Dixon	Milliken	

NAYS—235

Abbitt	Daddario	Haley
Abernethy	Daniels	Hardy
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Harris
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Harrison
Alford	Dawson	Hays
Alger	Delaney	Hechler
Anderson, Mont.	Dent	Hemphill
Andrews	Denton	Herlong
Anfuso	Diggs	Hogan
Ashley	Dingell	Holifield
Ashmore	Donohue	Holland
Aspinall	Dorn, S.C.	Huddleston
Bailey	Downing	Hull
Baker	Doyle	Icard
Baring	Dulski	Inouye
Barrett	Durham	Irwin
Bass, Tenn.	Edmondson	Jarman
Beckworth	Elliott	Jennings
Bennett, Fla.	Everett	Johnson, Calif.
Blatnik	Evyins	Johnson, Colo.
Blitch	Fallon	Johnson, Md.
Boggs	Farbstein	Johnson, Wis.
Boland	Fasell	Jonas
Bolling	Felghan	Jones, Mo.
Bowles	Fisher	Karsten
Brademas	Flood	Karth
Breeding	Flynn	Kasem
Brewster	Flynt	Kastenmeier
Brock	Fogarty	Kee
Brooks, La.	Foley	Kelly
Brooks, Tex.	Forand	Kilgore
Brown, Ga.	Forrester	King, Calif.
Brown, Mo.	Fountain	King, Utah
Broyhill	Friedel	Kirwan
Burke, Ky.	Gallagher	Kitchin
Burke, Mass.	Garmatz	Kluczynski
Byrne, Pa.	Gary	Landrum
Carnahan	Gathings	Lane
Casey	George	Lankford
Clark	Gialmo	Lennon
Coad	Granahan	Lesinski
Cohelan	Gray	Levering
Colmer	Green, Oreg.	Libonati
Cook	Green, Pa.	Loser
Cramer	Griffiths	McCormack
	Hagen	McDowell



McFall  
McGinley  
McGovern  
McSweeney  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Madden  
Mahon  
Marshall  
Matthews  
Metcalf  
Meyer  
Miller, Clem  
Miller, George P.  
Mills  
Mitchell  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris, Okla.  
Morrison  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy  
Murray  
Natcher  
Nix  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N.Y.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski

## NOT VOTING—56

Alexander  
Barden  
Barry  
Bonner  
Boykin  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Chelf  
Coffin  
Cooley  
Devine  
Dooley  
Dowdy  
Frazier  
Gavin  
Grant  
Hargis  
Harmon

O'Neill  
Oliver  
Passman  
Patman  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Poage  
Poff  
Porter  
Powell  
Preston  
Price  
Prokop  
Pucinski  
Quigley  
Rains  
Randall  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riley  
Rivers, Alaska  
Rivers, S.C.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Rutherford  
Saund  
Selden  
Shelley

Sheppard  
Shipley  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stubblefield  
Thomas  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thornberry  
Toll  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Udall  
Ullman  
Utt  
Vinson  
Watts  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wier  
Williams  
Willis  
Winstead  
Wolf  
Wright  
Yates  
Zablocki

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays, 163, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

## [Roll No. 60]

## YEAS—214

Addonizio  
Albert  
Alford  
Anderson, Mont.  
Andrews  
Anfuso  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Baring  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bass, Tenn.  
Beckworth  
Blatnik  
Blitch  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bowles  
Brademas  
Breeding  
Brewster  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Mo.  
Burke, Ky.  
Burke, Mass.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Canfield  
Carnahan  
Casey  
Celler  
Clark  
Coad  
Cohelan  
Cook  
Corbett  
Daddario  
Daniels  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson  
Delaney  
Dent  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn, N.Y.  
Doyle  
Dulski  
Durham  
Edmondson  
Elliott  
Everett  
Evins  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Felghan  
Fino  
Flood  
Flynn  
Fogarty  
Foley  
Forand  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Gallagher

## NAYS—163

Abbott  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Alger  
Allen  
Andersen, Minn.  
Arends  
Ashmore  
Auchincloss  
Avery  
Ayres  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barden  
Barry  
Bass, N.H.  
Bates  
Baumhart  
Becker  
Belcher  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bennett, Mich.

Griffin  
Gross  
Gubser  
Haley  
Halleck  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hoeven  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Holt  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Johnson, Md.  
Jonas  
Judd  
Kearns  
Keith  
King, Utah  
Kitchin  
Knox  
Kyl  
Laird  
Landrum  
Langen  
Latta  
Lennon

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Multer

## NOT VOTING—52

Alexander  
Bonner  
Boykin  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Chelf  
Coffin  
Cooley  
Devine  
Dooley  
Dowdy  
Frazier  
Gavin  
Grant  
Harmon  
Hébert  
Hoffman, Mich.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Lafore against.  
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Devine against.  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McIntire against.  
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Pelly against.  
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Taylor against.  
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Jackson against.  
Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Dooley against.  
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Scott against.  
Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Alexander against.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. McMillan against.  
Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Coffin against.  
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.  
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.  
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Siler against.  
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Kilburn against.  
Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Gavin against.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Mason against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]. If present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Walter against.  
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Pilcher against.  
Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.  
Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.  
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Bonner against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Montoya against.  
Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Morris of New Mexico against.  
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Burdick against.  
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Moeller against.  
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Chelf against.  
Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Harmon against.  
Mr. Gavin for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Barry.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Siler.  
Mr. Scott with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. HOLTZMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MAHON and Mr. ANFUSO changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this moment pass without comment. The Republicans tried to tack an amendment on the housing bill on civil rights. After their strong support for this amendment which they have demonstrated, I hope they will now also with equal sincerity sign the discharge petition for home rule for the District of Columbia. We need just 30 more of those sincere Republican signatures to bring the bill to the floor. Today would be an excellent day to sign.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### AMERICAN SEAMEN PICKETING OF UAR SHIP "CLEOPATRA"

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the failure of the administration and the State Department to protect the livelihood of American seamen, it has become necessary for them to do something to protect themselves; to call worldwide attention to the fact that because of the policy of boycott by the Arab countries against American ships that touch Israeli ports, these American ships and seamen suffer economic loss and privation. They have made evident that two can play at the same game by picketing the *Cleopatra*, a UAR ship in the port of New York.

The State Department contends that the boycotts and blockades are a matter for the U.N.—this despite the fact that Mr. Hammarskjöld has admitted that he can do nothing with Nasser.

The presumption by the State Department that the picketing is regarded abroad as a political demonstration related to the United Arab restrictions against Israel is unfortunate. That complex foreign policy questions are involved is similarly unfortunate. The fact remains that the courts in this country have three times denied injunctions against the pickets, one as late as Tuesday of this week, is evidence that it is considered a legitimate labor dispute. That questions of foreign policy are involved is incidental to the main question stated by Paul Hall, president of the International Seafarer's Union, that many U.S. seamen had lost jobs because of the Arab boycott.

Rather than deplore this picketing or feeling embarrassed, I suggest that strong representation should be made to the Arab countries to refrain from boycotting American ships that touch Israeli ports.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1558)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 21, 25, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 16, 19, 28, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,069,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,761,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$1,253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,202,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,567,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$29,591,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,688,691,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,579,383,264.47"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$46,042,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$6,262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,363,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 12, 13, 23, and 27.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
ALBERT THOMAS,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

SFESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
ESTES KEPAUVER,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.



## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration  
Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Deletes language proposed by the Senate for official entertainment expenses.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$2,660,875 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,822,400 as proposed by the Senate.

## Office of Field Services

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$2,584,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,415,025 as proposed by the House.

## Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$8,898,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,947,500 as proposed by the House.

## Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$17,400,000 instead of \$18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$15,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Business and Defense Services  
Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$4,069,000 instead of \$4,366,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,772,000 as proposed by the House.

## Bureau of Foreign Commerce

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$2,761,600 instead of \$3,139,100 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,384,100 as proposed by the House.

Maritime activities  
Salaries and Expenses

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11: Appropriate \$14,500,000 instead of \$14,920,800 as proposed by the Senate and \$14,125,335 as proposed by the House, within limitations as follows: Administrative expenses, \$8,045,000 instead of \$8,086,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$8,009,700 as proposed by the House; maintenance of shipyard facilities and operation of warehouses, \$1,253,000 instead of \$1,320,800 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,190,835 as proposed by the House; and Reserve fleet expenses, \$5,202,000 instead of \$5,514,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,924,800 as proposed by the House.

## Maritime training

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

## General provisions—Maritime activities

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

## Patent Office

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$22,567,500 instead of \$22,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$22,535,000 as proposed by the House.

## Bureau of Public Roads

Limitation on General Administrative  
Expenses

Amendment No. 15: Provides limitation of \$29,591,500 instead of \$29,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$29,283,000 as proposed by the House.

Repayable Advances to the Highway Trust  
Fund

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$160,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

## Federal-aid Highways (Trust Fund)

Amendments Nos. 17, 18, and 19: Appropriate \$2,688,691,500 instead of \$2,689,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$2,687,383,000 as proposed by the House, of which the part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1960 shall be \$1,579,383,264.47 instead of \$1,579,691,764.47 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,579,074,764.47 as proposed by the House; and provides \$10,000,000 for reimbursement of sums expended for emergency repair of highways and bridges as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

## National Bureau of Standards

## Research and Technical Services

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$18,800,000 instead of \$19,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Research and Technical Services (Special  
Foreign Currency Program)

Amendment No. 21: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$1,030,000 for the purchase of foreign currencies. The committee of conference has deferred appropriations for this purpose so that the objectives of the program may be given further study.

## Weather Bureau

## Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$46,042,900 instead of \$48,100,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$43,985,900 as proposed by the House.

## Research and Development

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$6,262,500 instead of \$7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$5,025,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that flying safety should be given priority over beginning new research programs; and has allowed the \$300,000 proposed by the Senate for additional flight time and instrumentation of aircraft.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making funds available until expended.

## Establishment of Meteorological Facilities

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$5,250,000 instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

## TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development  
Corporation

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Small Business Administration  
Salaries and Expenses

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29: Appropriate \$5,597,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,201,000 as proposed by the House; and provide for the transfer of \$16,363,000 instead of \$17,563,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$15,763,000 as proposed by the House from the revolving fund.

## Revolving Fund

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$47,920,000 as proposed by the Senate for additional capital.

Grants for Research and Management  
Counseling

Amendment No. 31: Deletes appropriation of \$2,080,000 proposed by the Senate.

## Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$2,455,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,295,000 as proposed by the House.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
ALBERT THOMAS,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 8, insert "Provided, That not to exceed \$100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation 'Ship construction (liquidation of contract authorization) maritime activities,' may be transferred to this appropriation for the purpose of providing furnishings and equipment for the Memorial Chapel at King's Point, New York (62 Stat. 172)."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How does the bill compare in its present form with the bill the House sent to the other body?

Mr. PRESTON. I will be glad to make a statement on that point. The budget estimates on this bill were \$799,615,000. The House reduced that to \$760,522,235, a cut of \$39,092,765.

The Senate bill further reduced the amounts from \$760,522,235 to \$738,388,300 through the device of cutting the repayable advance to the highway trust fund; and that was made possible due to the fact that two points of order were made on the floor against forest highways and public lands highways because the language the Budget sent us undertook to put those two categories under the trust fund. Points of order were made that knocked them out; consequently the Senate was then in a position to reduce the repayable advance to the trust fund appropriation by \$40 million. So that is the method they used to reduce our total. However, I may say we further reduced the bill in conference from \$738,388,300 in the Senate bill to \$729,624,375, a reduction of \$8,763,925 on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. GROSS. That is on the basis of the budget estimate?

Mr. PRESTON. No. The budget estimate was \$799,615,000. We are down to \$729,624,375, or a reduction in the bill of \$69,990,625 from the way it originally came to the House.

Mr. GROSS. How does that compare with spending for the same purpose for the current fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. The appropriation last year was \$1,081,097,900. It is now down to \$729,624,375, a reduction of \$351,473,525.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13. On page 12, line 11, insert "No common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government (military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with said companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$10,000 at the discretion of the Courts for each such violation."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 18, line 13, insert "Including the transfer from the Department of Defense, without payment therefor, of one aircraft."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 22, line 17, insert "": *Provided*, That the next audit of such Corporation by the Comptroller General shall be for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1960, and thereafter such audits shall be for each calendar year."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### HARRY ALPERT ON THE GOVERNMENT'S GROWING RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, most of our effort, both private and public, goes to advance our knowledge in the non-human sciences and not where we most need it, namely, the various social sciences.

My friend, Dr. Harry Alpert, dean of graduate school and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, writes encouragingly about "the Government's growing recognition of social science" in the January 1960 issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.

We're making some progress, but congressional confusion—

says Dr. Alpert—

regarding social science has by no means been completely eliminated. Negative attitudes still persist and need to be reckoned with.

Under a previous consent I am including the text of his article:

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S GROWING RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

(By Harry Alpert)

Abstract: Important new developments have strengthened the standing of the social sciences in the Federal Government. Historical analysis emphasizes the recency of the Government's recognition of the national contributions of social science research. Significant progress has been made despite critical fluctuations. Five factors contributing to the more favored governmental position of social science research are (1) changing congressional attitudes; (2) acceptance of the social sciences at the White House level; (3) inclusion of the social sciences as part of broad definitions of scientific disciplines; (4) the general post-sputnik interest in American education; and (5) the concern with redressing imbalances in American higher education. Research support for the social sciences is growing but a critical shortage remains in funds for fellowships and assistantships. The social sciences approach the next decade in a climate of acceptance and encouragement.

"They never had it so good." This vernacular phrase may startle grammarians, but it describes accurately the present position of the social sciences with respect to support and interest by the Federal Government. As the result of important new developments which have served to consolidate the standing of the social sciences in the Federal Government, there is every likelihood that the 10 years from 1950 to 1960 will be viewed as the "March" decade of the social sciences. March, according to folk weather lore, comes in like a lion and goes out like a lamb. Similarly, the 1950's may be said to have come in with a roaring antipathy to the social sciences and to be departing with attitudes of positive interest and quiet acceptance.

That it has taken so long for the Federal Government to develop a *modus vivendi* with the social sciences is quite ironical, for its involvement in social research was written into the U.S. Constitution. By providing for a decennial census and making this count of the population the basis for representation in Congress, our Founding Fathers made a social science activity the ultimate basis of political power.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Don K. Price, "Government and Science" (New York: New York University Press, 1954), p. 5.

In fact, the gathering, analysis, and dissemination of social and economic statistics has continued to be one of the three major ways in which the Federal Government relates itself to the social sciences. The other two are: exploitation and utilization of the findings and results of social research; and direct support of social sciences through the intramural conduct of social science research in the Federal Government's own research laboratories and units or through contracts and grants for extramural social science studies at colleges and universities, other nonprofit organizations, and business and commercial establishments.

#### PRE-WORLD WAR II STATUS

Up to World War II, the role of the Federal Government in the social sciences consisted largely of the first two of these functions, namely, producing mass statistical series and exploiting social science findings produced outside of the Government. During the 19th century, the social sciences played a modest but effective role in the development of Government powers and programs. Don K. Price has called attention to the contribution of economic and statistical series in the growing development of the regulation of business, as well as to the impact of John R. Commons' institutional economics on labor legislation and of Charles Francis Adams' studies on the regulation of railroads.<sup>2</sup>

Even as late as 1940, the Government's direct activities in the social sciences were still predominantly confined to the collection and analysis of statistical information.<sup>3</sup> However, the roots of later developments in the Government's social science programs were discernible in the 1920's. The appointment by President Hoover of a research committee on recent social trends provided significant White House endorsement of a major social science enterprise. Further impetus for governmental support of the social sciences came in the thirties from the practical programs of the New Deal. An outstanding example was the Department of Agriculture's Division of Program Surveys which assumed the leadership in introducing the sample interview survey as a basic social science tool and as an instrument of governmental policy.

#### IMPACT OF WORLD WAR II

But the defense mobilization period and World War II itself were undoubtedly the major catalytic events leading to the expansion of the Federal Government's programs of social science research. The events of the war on both the military and civilian fronts and the problems of postwar adjustment as they affected the nation and the individual provided the social sciences with dramatic opportunities to demonstrate their practical value and essential role in modern society. A brief review of illustrative uses of social science during World War II lists eight examples of problem areas in which important social science research accomplishments were achieved: soldier orientation and morale; analysis of command problems, particularly among Negro troops; more efficient use of psychiatry; venereal disease control; analysis of the American soldier's problems of adjustment, combat performance, and response to mass communications; evaluation of Japanese morale; estimation of war production requirements; and regulation of prices and rationing.<sup>4</sup> To this list may be added the

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>3</sup> The several paragraphs which follow are adapted from the author's chapter on "The Growth of Social Research in the United States" in Daniel Lerner, editor, "The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences" (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), pp. 73-86.

<sup>4</sup> Russell Sage Foundation, "Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services" (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950).



media analysis activities of the Office of War Information and the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; the propaganda studies of the Library of Congress, Department of Justice, and various intelligence agencies; the surveys of war bond purchases and other evaluations of the effectiveness of drives; the testing of the public comprehension of governmental information materials; and research on national character and other problems related to a better understanding of the behavioral characteristics of foreign peoples.

The immediate postwar period of demobilization witnessed the dismantling and disappearance of many of these wartime programs. Dissatisfaction with the limited accomplishments of some of these social science activities was expressed, largely as the result of the disillusionment which set in when excessive promises of achievement were unfulfilled. Social scientists became their own worst enemies by promising too much, too fast and accepting funds in excess of what could be effectively expended. Moreover, the social sciences have suffered from their minority group status among the scientific disciplines. Like minority groups on the labor market, they are subject to the rule of "last hired, first fired." Thus, many social science programs were speedily demobilized because of their relatively low priority and because of a failure to appreciate their long-range implications and future contributions.

Nevertheless, significant efforts were made to continue programs which had demonstrated their effectiveness during the war. The Office of Naval Research, created shortly after World War II, supported research on manpower problems, personnel and training, group morale, organizational structure, and related social psychological areas. The Army continued, in abbreviated form, its studies of opinions and attitudes of American soldiers. The new Department of the Air Force, proud of the accomplishments of the aviation psychology program, organized units to undertake and support research in problems of selection and training, manpower, leadership, human relations and morale, and psychological warfare. When the Research and Development Board was established in the Department of Defense it included a Committee on Human Resources.

However, the skepticism and disenchantment which many of these programs engendered did not provide a favorable environment for their persistent growth and development. There set in, consequently, a period of recurring ups and downs, of "acute, and sometimes critical fluctuations," as Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., has described it.<sup>5</sup> A "starts and fits" pattern became evident: An activity got started and then was curtailed or discontinued when some Congressman or general threw a fit. The Division of Research of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the excellent survey research unit of the Veterans' Administration, the Air Force's Human Resources Research Institute at Maxwell Field and its Personnel and Training Center at Lackland Air Force Base were but a few of the research units which experienced difficulty.

Despite the on again, off again character of some of these programs, the long-term trend was toward increasing appreciation of the social sciences as valuable national assets. As the postwar pattern of extramural support developed, the social sciences, too, received encouragement, although not at the same rate and magnitude as the physical and life sciences.

#### THE "MARCH" DECADE

The "March" decade, 1950-60, will perhaps be viewed historically as the turning point

<sup>5</sup> Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., in foreword to Morris Janowitz, "Sociology and the Military Establishment" (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959), p. 5.

in Federal Government recognition of the social sciences. The full measure of the change from the "lion" to the "lamb" phase of this decade may be observed in comparing the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In the former legislation, the social sciences are included only on a permissive basis and are referred to only as other sciences. In the 1958 act, the section dealing with graduate fellowships mentions no limitations whatsoever with respect to disciplines. Moreover, a separate title provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. This act also recognizes the importance of improving statistical series in the field of education.

Note must be taken, also, of other evidences of changing attitudes toward the social sciences, such as the establishment, in December 1958, of an Office of Social Sciences within the National Science Foundation; the appointment, in the spring of 1959, of a sociologist, President Logan Wilson of the University of Texas,<sup>6</sup> as a member of the National Science Board; and the expansion of the social science research activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the vernacular of the boxing ring, it may be said that the social sciences were, for several years definitely "rocky and punch drunk," but were still on their feet when the fight was over. They have survived Cox committee and Reese committee investigations. They have endured pariah status and innumerable reorganizations. They have weathered appropriation storms which threatened to cut off funds for studies of child-rearing practices, mother-love among lambs, population dynamics, message diffusion, and other projects which became the pet peeves of individual legislators.

#### MAJOR DYNAMIC FACTORS

In attempting to assess the major factors that account for the more favorable position in which the social sciences find themselves at the end of this decade, I am able to identify five important considerations: (1) Changing congressional attitudes; (2) acceptance of the social sciences at the White House level; (3) inclusion of the social sciences as part of broad umbrella definitions of scientific disciplines; (4) the general post-sputnik interest in American education; and (5) the concern with redressing the imbalances in education which stemmed from the earlier, almost exclusive, emphasis on natural science and mathematics. Brief comments on each of these five factors follow:

#### CHANGING CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDES

In his report on the crucial Senate debate in 1946 which preceded the vote to exclude from the then pending bill to establish a National Science Foundation the specific provision which created a Division of Social Sciences, George A. Lundberg concluded that the Senate thought of the social sciences as at best "a propagandist, reformist, evangelical sort of cult."<sup>7</sup> The unfortunate phonetic confusion of social science with socialism reinforced such viewpoints. Just a few years later, however, more positive attitudes were being expressed. In 1953, the Cox committee, in its final report, noted the special importance of the social sciences in the contemporary world. It stated:

"It is entirely possible that in a time when man's mastery over the physical sciences threatens him with possible extermination the eventual reward from the pursuit

of the social sciences may prove even more important than the accomplishments in the physical sciences."

Other important turning points in congressional expressions toward the social sciences were the vigorous statements by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency in 1955, 1956, and 1957; the 1955 recommendations of Representative RICHARD BOLLING's Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY's report to the Senate in 1957 of his experiences in the Middle East; and speeches by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, and others.<sup>8</sup> This year neither House of Congress raised any objections to the National Science Foundation's request for \$2 million for support of basic research in the social sciences in fiscal year 1960, even though this represented a considerable increase over the \$850,000 appropriated for this purpose for fiscal year 1959. (The actual budgetary allowance for social science research in the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1960 is \$1,600,000.)

This is an encouraging picture, indeed. But congressional confusion regarding social science has by no means been completely eliminated. Negative attitudes still persist and need to be reckoned with.<sup>9</sup>

#### WHITE HOUSE INTEREST

The White House, too, has shown increasing interest in the support of the social sciences. In his state of the Union message delivered on January 9, 1959, President Eisenhower expressed his desire to undertake a systematic study of American values, goals, and social trends, comparable to the earlier Hoover Committee study.

The objective, President Eisenhower said, would be "the establishment of national goals that would not only spur us on to our finest efforts but would meet the stern test of practicality." He hoped that this new study would be concerned, among other things, "with the acceleration of our economy's growth and the living standards of our people, their health and education, their better assurance of life and liberty and their greater opportunities." He noted that the report of Hoover's Recent Social Trends Committee "has stood the test of time and has had a beneficial influence on national development." Here, indeed, is a significant compliment to social science.

And in its report on "Strengthening American Science," issued December 27, 1958, the President's Science Advisory Committee included social psychology among the scientific disciplines for which a strong case could be made for intensifying the Nation's scientific effort. The Committee stated, "And advances in social psychology might help to reduce tension and conflict at every level of human intercourse—in our communities, in business and industry, in

<sup>8</sup> Final report of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and Other Organizations, 82d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 2514, Union Calendar No. 801 (Washington: Government Printing Office, Jan. 1, 1953), pp. 9-10.

<sup>9</sup> For details and references, see Harry Alpert, "Congressmen, Social Scientists, and Attitudes Toward Federal Support of Social Science Research," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 23, No. 6 (December 1958), pp. 682-686.

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Independent Offices Appropriations for 1960. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 527. For a discussion of persisting negative attitudes, see Harry Alpert, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Wilson was subsequently required by Texas law to give up his membership on the National Science Board.

<sup>7</sup> "The Senate Ponders Social Science," *The Scientific Monthly*, vol. 64, No. 5 (May 1947), p. 399.

Government, and even among nations." <sup>11</sup> Furthermore, as previously noted, President Eisenhower has appointed a social scientist to the National Science Board. This policy-determining body for government science on January 23, 1959, adopted the following statement:

The National Science Board recognized the importance, as well as the complexity and difficulty, of research in the social sciences. It is clear that the intellectual, economic, and social strength of our Nation requires a vigorous approach to social problems, with scientific techniques of study making their maximum contribution. <sup>12</sup>

#### PROTECTIVE UMBRELLAS

The social sciences have prospered best in the Federal Government where they have been included under broad umbrella classifications of the scientific discipline such as agricultural sciences, military sciences, medical sciences, and health sciences. Under such umbrellas and in close company with scientific areas which enjoy the prestige and status of biological or physical sciences, the social sciences have enjoyed a protection and nourishment which they normally do not have when they are identified as such and stand exposed, naked and alone.

Agricultural research has been heavily supported by the Federal Government from its very inception. Quite early the concept of agricultural sciences was broadened to include not only biological research but agricultural economics and rural sociology as well. In fact, for many years the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Agricultural Economics was internationally famous for its leadership in significant areas of social and economic research. Although from time to time specific social science projects of the Department of Agriculture have suffered congressional attack, there has been little question of the legitimacy of the inclusion of social research in the scientific program of the Department. In fact, one appropriation committee, with remarkable indifference to the distinction between biological and social science research, once included, in a list of fields for which research funds were not to be expended, the orchids of Guatemala, the flora of Dominica, child-rearing practices, research methodology, and population dynamics.

The medical sciences and health sciences rubrics have also provided generous hospitality to the social sciences. Social science research projects are given careful and sympathetic consideration by at least five study sections of the National Institutes of Health: Behavioral sciences, hospital facilities research, mental health, nursing research, and public health research. Social scientists serve as members of these study sections as well as on several other committees of the National Institutes of Health. The National Institute of Mental Health's Laboratory of Socio-Environmental Studies is outstanding in the quality of its research program.

Research undertaken by the Military Establishment in relation to the defense needs of the Nation develops strong immunities to congressional or other attacks if military authorities certify its importance to the mission of the Department of Defense. Despite the ups and downs previously referred to, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have arrived at a realization of the importance of basic research in the social sciences. The Office of Naval Research includes a Psychological Science Division. The Air Force has established a behavioral sciences program in its

Office of Scientific Research. And here is the testimony of an Army general presented recently before an appropriations committee:

"We can never afford to neglect basic research and the Army wants to do more of it whenever we find applicable projects to further this increase of scientific knowledge. Such research is not confined to the physical sciences. Investigation of the social sciences to help us to utilize more effectively our manpower and insure man-machine compatibility with complex engines of war being developed is vital. Should we neglect these important considerations we only aggravate the trend in which the physical sciences are outstripping the social sciences and may, in time, reach a point where the machine may destroy its maker." <sup>13</sup>

These are the words of Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army.

Another important umbrella for the social sciences is Operations Research. The various operations research units supported by the Federal Government have invariably included a social science component.

#### IMPACT OF SPUTNIKS

The social sciences have not been indifferent to the whirl of the Russian sputniks and have directly felt the impact of these successes in space technology. It was recognized that Soviet Russia's accomplishment was not only the result of advances in science and engineering but also the consequence of a social system that was capable of making and carrying out significant decisions. Interest developed in studies of the social, economic, and political implications of the space age. It became imperative that we keep ahead of the Russians in the social science fields. For this reason, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON encouraged the formation of a committee on national support for behavioral science which reported on social science needs to the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. Substantially increased appropriations were made available to the National Science Foundation, and in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Congress officially declared as national policy the doctrine that the defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles, and, as well, upon "the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge." <sup>14</sup>

#### REDRESSING IMBALANCES

For a time, it looked as if only the natural sciences and mathematics would be the beneficiaries of the increased responsibilities of the Federal Government toward research and education. Programs were quickly organized to improve the quality of science teaching, to train more scientists and engineers, and to intensify the pace of research in the physical, mathematical, and biological sciences. It became evident, however, that the neglect of other areas of scholarship and learning would spell national disaster. The Government's difficulties in international relations led to intensified interest in language study. Soon voices were heard calling attention to the need to redress the imbalances in American education which a predominant concern with the natural sciences and engineering was creating. <sup>15</sup> Cognizance of this requirement is found in the newly released report of the President's

Science Advisory Committee on "Education for the Age of Science." This report stresses the fact that, "Today in America we need a very wide variety of human talents." <sup>16</sup> It goes on to urge that "a proper balance be maintained in our educational offerings." <sup>17</sup> To achieve such a balance we must encourage intellectual leadership in the humanities and social sciences as well as in the natural sciences and mathematics.

#### HEALTHY PROGNOSIS

The social sciences thus face the 1960's in an atmosphere of encouragement and with the active support of influential well-wishers. Research funds are becoming more plentiful. The Federal Government alone will soon be spending in the neighborhood of \$60 million a year in support of the social sciences. This estimate does not include the \$100 million or so that the decennial census of 1960 will cost.

#### MORE FELLOWSHIPS NEEDED

A major problem, however, remains. The most urgent need of the social sciences is expansion of the pool of available trained, specialized manpower. Recent studies have indicated that the length of time required to obtain the Ph. D. degree is stongly influenced by the availability of financial support to graduate students in the form of assistantships and fellowships. It is here that the social sciences, and humanities, too, are most seriously disadvantaged vis-a-vis the natural sciences. The major bottleneck in the advancement of the social sciences is not research funds, but fellowship and scholarship opportunities for basic and advanced training. If the social sciences are to fulfill the general public's expectations of them, they must double, at least, the number of trained practitioners. To make the training process more productive and more effective, however, additional fellowships and other types of financial support for training are an imperative and critical necessity. Title IV of the National Defense Education Act has been extremely helpful in this regard. Almost a fourth (23 percent) of the first 1,000 graduate fellowships were awarded in the social sciences. The various training programs of the National Institutes of Health also provide valuable opportunities for social science education. But more needs to be done. The National Science Foundation, for example, has the basic legislation to include the social sciences within its education in the science program. It also has reasonably adequate funds for training and education. It has broadened its conception of the social sciences in its research support program. Only administrative nearsightedness prevents it from giving the social sciences, broadly conceived, their deserved place within the various program activities of its Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

#### COMPLACENCY TO BE AVOIDED

We can be proud of the achievements of the social sciences in government, but we cannot afford to be complacent. Certain past mistakes must be avoided: premature promises, excessive expectations, hasty growth, disastrous indifference to the political process, unwarranted impatience with the administrative processes of justification and review, and lack of concern with the public image of the social sciences. By careful planning and effective operations a solid basis can be established for future growth.

Advance in the social sciences will depend most immediately on what in fact social scientists do: how well they teach at the undergraduate level, how well they communicate with the general public, how effective

<sup>11</sup> "Strengthening American Science": a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 4.

<sup>12</sup> Reproduced in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Mar. 10, 1959.

<sup>13</sup> Department of Defense Appropriations for 1960. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 339.

<sup>14</sup> Public Law 85-864, sec. 101.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, statements by Pendleton Herring and Harry Alpert in the Feb. 1, 1958 issue of the Saturday Review (vol. 41, No. 5).

<sup>16</sup> "Education for the Age of Science." President's Science Advisory Committee (May 24, 1959), p. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 6.



tively they respond to calls from industry and government for help in resolving practical problems, and how much they devote to fundamental research. It depends also on their willingness to cultivate patience and humility.<sup>18</sup> Charles Dollard has well defined the problem: "The long-term contract of the social scientist with society is not to perform miracles but to bring to the study of man and his problems the same objectivity and the same passion for truth which have in the past given us some understanding and control of the physical world."<sup>19</sup>

#### POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to correct an inequity resulting from the policy of paying postal service employees uniform national rates of basic salary. Clerks and carriers of metropolitan and urban post offices are recruited and paid at the same basic salary rates as are paid to clerks and carriers of small community post offices, irrespective of the fact that the city area may have a labor shortage, a higher cost of living, or excessively higher rates of pay in comparison to the postal service salary rates.

It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a proper differential between the salaries of employees in the larger city post offices having a critical labor shortage and the salaries of employees in post offices where there is no labor shortage. This proposal will apply to approximately 200,000 employees in at least 50 of our larger metropolitan and urban areas.

The inequitable operation of the present pay system and the unrealistic entrance rate for employees in labor shortage areas cause a continual recruitment problem in the cities which I represent, such as Yonkers, N.Y. Turnover rates are increasing with incident after incident of trained and highly capable employees leaving the local post offices to accept higher paying positions in private industry. Postal service employees in these areas are finding it more and more difficult, with their incomes lagging so far behind the increased cost of living, to make ends meet and to purchase the commodities they must have to maintain themselves and their families in a reasonable standard of living. This situation is bound to have a damaging effect on the employees' morale and consequently, on the effectiveness of their performance as personnel of the post office.

The cost of recruiting and training new employees and bringing them up through the necessary period of service, to the standard of production of those they replace is a tremendous item of expense. The cost of recruiting and training is aside from the undoubted delays and impediments to progress in carrying out the essential handling of the mails which result from high employee turnover. Improved morale and effectiveness of employee performance will result from adequate pay scales and be of major benefit to the post office.

I am firm in my belief that the increased efficiency by the employees who will be attracted to the postal service by more realistic entrance rates, and the reduction in the cost of recruiting and training which is bound to accompany a reduction in the rates of turnover because of an adjustment in existing rates in these labor shortage areas, will absorb a significant portion of the estimated annual cost of \$125 million.

The Civil Service Commission has been empowered to authorize employment at higher than minimum rates in shortage categories and by area and location in order to aid recruitment, but the Postmaster General does not have any flexibility to adjust to local conditions or to changing conditions. I believe the benefits under this bill will go a long way toward eliminating these problems by establishing a realistic entrance rate for postal service employees at post offices in the large cities and by granting the Postmaster General the flexibility to meet changing conditions and labor shortages.

There are two main features of this bill. First, the bill will provide a needed increase, ranging from 10 to 14 percent, for postal employees at post offices located in cities with a population of over 250,000. It will establish realistic entrance rates ranging between \$80.52 and \$88.40 per week for clerks and carriers in such post offices, which certainly are the minimum rates we should be paying our clerks and carriers in these high cost-of-living cities. The new rates would terminate automatically if the area ceased to meet requirements set forth in the bill.

Second, the bill would grant the Postmaster General the flexibility to authorize adjustments in the rates of employees in other areas whenever he finds such adjustments to be warranted by reason of the cost of living or conditions of employment.

#### IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, few people will deny that one of the primary obligations of the Congress and the Nation is to provide adequate benefits for our aged and disabled under our Social Security system.

At present, while the system has brought marked improvements in this

field, it does not include many worthy older people who are urgently in need of assistance.

To my mind, it must be the province of the Congress to consider a much broader program that will fully, adequately, and, without discrimination, provide suitable coverage for our older fellow citizens and their families.

Rising prices, inflation, and improvements in standards of living are all serving to minimize the effectiveness of the present program. In most cases, current benefits are not only inadequate, but shockingly inadequate.

With the national product bounding toward an annual figure of \$500 billion, certainly this Nation, which has done so much for the security and betterment of people all over the world, should be able to channel a more substantial portion of our huge annual income to urgent national needs in the field of social security, health, and the general well-being of the American people, the old and the young.

I do not mean to suggest that we should adopt a paternalistic or socialistic pattern in coping with these great problems. I think that we should move with all possible speed to perfect and amplify the system and instrumentalities which we have provided for social security, health, and general welfare.

There is nothing in these proposals for social security betterment which, in my opinion, this Government cannot and should not undertake without interfering in any way with freedom of the individual and without injuring our free enterprise institutions.

Social security, health, and welfare improvements are not only a great moral and humane end, but if handled intelligently and wisely, will actually provide greater efficiency and economy in the administration of social assistance programs at every level of Government—local, State, and Federal.

In this great Nation, we have already established the principle, both on a moral and legal basis that we must and will provide for the handicapped, the helpless, the afflicted and distressed peoples of the land. On the whole, the benefits we have established are available to provide for the ordinary needs of people who are unable to provide for themselves.

But there is a strong obligation further to broaden the basis, expand the coverage, and increase the scope and depth of this program to make it really effective at a time when prices are steadily advancing and many are hard pressed to cope with the high costs of living.

An adequate program will be expensive and costly; there is no doubt of that fact. It will have to be paid for by taxing the American people as a whole. If it is established on a sound basis the impact of this tax increase would not be prohibitive, and it most emphatically would not impose burdens on our economic system and our people which they would be unable to bear, in fact all the available evidence we have on hand at the moment indicates that this country could not only bear these costs, but could much better afford to pay them than to dole out more billions,

<sup>18</sup> See *The Saturday Review*, vol. 41, No. 5 (Feb. 1, 1958), p. 38 and the *Saturday Review*, vol. 42, No. 14 (Apr. 4, 1959), p. 64.

<sup>19</sup> "Strategy for Advancing the Social Sciences," in *Social Science Research Center of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota, the Social Sciences at Mid-Century* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952), pp. 19-20.

wastefully, extravagantly, and uneconomically, for certain foreign aid programs.

The question of medical and hospital care and treatment is taking on new significance in the light of rapidly increasing costs in this field. A prominent hospital administrator speaking at Boston the other day stated that before long hospital care would cost from \$65 to \$70 per day. Obviously, most of our people could not afford, nor could they absorb, such costs.

I have known of several instances of friends and constituents taken with chronic illnesses requiring extended hospitalization whose entire life savings put away for a rainy day were eaten up by these costs leaving them and their dependents penniless in their advanced years.

We have the greatest system of medicine in the world. Our doctors are the best and most dedicated in the world. They work under our free system, like practically every one else in our economy, and that is the way it should be.

Nothing should be done, in my opinion, regardless of what this Congress may do to extend or firm up our health and hospital benefits, to socialize American medicine, any more than to socialize other parts of our economy.

There is no excuse or justification whatever for singling out doctors for socialization or regimentation or discriminatory treatment under any laws to be enacted by Congress. It is both desirable and essential that Americans should have the right to select their doctors and their hospitals and the conditions under which they shall be cared for.

It is very questionable that the present social security benefits, and present voluntary plans as currently organized and implemented, can adequately discharge the necessary obligation of providing proper medical and hospital care and treatment for most of the American people in the long run.

This problem is also beyond the means and the capabilities of local and State agencies. For that reason, Congress must consider some action to make sure that the American people shall be able to receive adequate medical and hospital care on a reasonable basis without bankrupting themselves and their families.

This is not only a problem, but a challenge, for the Congress.

It is obvious that the question requires further and most careful study in order that any plan adopted will be adequate, effective, fair and administratively feasible.

There can be no substantial delay in tackling this problem. Immediate attention should be given to all pending proposals, including not only those relating to improvement of social security laws, but also those which pertain to the strengthening of voluntary plans, or developing additional voluntary measures capable of doing the job that has to be done.

The public health is basic to the strength and welfare of the Nation and in this enlightened age with medical, re-

search, and industrial science providing such effective techniques and remedies for many major diseases, chronic diseases and serious medical conditions that afflict mankind, it is of special importance that the Congress should not further delay careful consideration of this vital question.

The plight of our aged people, notwithstanding our great material product, is not improved, but is in many respects retrogressing. For one reason or another, older people, who used to be taken care of in the homes, are now being transferred to rest homes, or into housing projects for the elderly, where they are set apart from the rest of society as a class separate and distinct from their families, their former associates and friends and the normal currents and channels of social life. Some of them are, so to speak—and this is tragic and pathetic—almost in the role of untouchables pushed aside into a corner, lonely and friendless, to spend the rest of their days alone in relative isolation and solitude.

If, as a Nation, we are not able to grapple with problems of this kind and settle them in a fair, humane way and in a way that is compatible with our much vaunted moral, humane, and free enterprise standards then we are certainly not living up to the principles of the Divine Ruler, nor are we being worthy of the great traditions of free government and human brotherhood which are supposed to be a part of our proud American heritage.

The distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, my esteemed and beloved friend, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, aided by his splendid committee, and supported by the Congress, has unselfishly given of his time, energy, ability, and great talents to the solution of many of these problems. Few men in the history of the American Congress have worked with more devotion, with more wholehearted spirit, with more zeal, humaneness, and affectiveness to broaden our programs for better health, and better conditions for our people than this great American statesman, JOHN FOGARTY.

During the years he has been in Congress, Congressman FOGARTY has made such noteworthy contributions in the field of health, education, labor, and welfare as to evoke the admiration and gratitude of all his colleagues and the Nation. His leadership in rounding out and advancing these programs has not only been outstanding, but is certainly one of the great achievements recorded in the Congress during its long, illustrious history.

Understandably, this distinguished, humane son of Rhode Island has received the hearty cooperation of his colleagues here in the House and in the other body, and it is a source of gratification to those of us who serve with him in this greatest of all democratic, legislative bodies that he has decided to continue to serve in the House.

If he so chose, he could undoubtedly be elected to the other body. It was his judgment, however—and I believe it was a wise one—that as senior Member of the House he can be much more effective in

serving both his constituents and the Nation than as a junior Member of the other body.

I am sure that Congressman FOGARTY will continue his deep interest and intensive efforts in these important, vital fields of health and social welfare, and I, for one, and many others who feel as I do, are most anxious to associate ourselves with the fine work that Congressman FOGARTY is doing, and the high objectives that he has in mind.

It is only by pursuing these great programs for individual and collective social benefits of the people that we can strengthen and improve our great Nation and make it the vitally strong and vigorously healthy force that it should be, not only in assisting, promoting, and perfecting democracy and free institutions here in our own country, but in broadcasting the principles and lessons of brotherhood and humanity, freedom and justice to the world.

I hope and urge that the appropriate committees of the Congress may continue their studies of these great humane questions, and before the end of the session, bring appropriate legislation before the House which will mark distinct advancement and progress in these fields which are of such profound concern for the Nation and the American people.

To summarize my text: It is now clear that the aged, our proud and beloved veterans of industry, agriculture, and our many trades and professions, have problems that go beyond inadequacies of income. Large numbers of our aged, though mentally and physically alert and well, are compelled to live in enforced idleness constituting a great potential of productivity and creative talent that is being shamefully wasted.

Many others suffer and wither away almost like prisoners in their little cells of loneliness shunted into isolated corners of a society they, at great personal sacrifice, loyally, faithfully, and constructively served during their more vigorous days and which now turns its back on them.

These conditions affecting our aged citizens have become most challenging. The Congress cannot do much to compel their families and communities to take a more humane and loving attitude toward the aged, since that is a spiritual, personal duty that lies primarily in the realm of conscience.

But the Congress has its own obligation to vote them adequate security benefits, to help provide for their health needs and to do something about creating for them the opportunity to follow some useful work to supplement their meager incomes.

Comprehensive, earnest surveys to ameliorate these more glaring deficiencies in our treatment of our aged have been too long delayed. We should with all possible dispatch move not only to study these conditions and questions affecting our aged but we must take expeditious action in order to instill some more decent measure of humaneness, brotherhood, and justice in the treatment this great Government and its people accords to our older citizens in the sunset of their years.



## GEORGE F. SHEA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has lost a very distinguished, able, and devoted public servant in the death of George F. Shea. Mr. Shea, as Chairman of the Armory Board, worked untiringly and unceasingly in the interests of the welfare of the people of the District and to make it worthy to be an outstanding capital of the world.

As Chairman of the Armory Board, Mr. Shea unselfishly devoted his time, his efforts, and his superlative talents to bring about the construction of the District stadium, which he envisioned not only as a showplace, but as a much needed place for sports, civic, and international affairs to be conducted.

It was my good fortune to meet Mr. Shea when I first came to Congress. Mr. Shea was a brilliant lawyer, an exceptionally well-read man, who had a keen understanding of human nature, a most pleasing and magnetic personality, with warmth which readily ingratiated him to all who had the good fortune to know him. Mr. Shea was very serious minded, yet had a sense of humor and an abundance of knowledge that made it delightful to be in his company.

George led a happy and exemplary life, and was devoted to his family.

His keen, analytical mind simplified many problems that confronted him, and his associates, whether he was dealing with an adversary or a friend. Mr. Shea was recognized as an outstanding lawyer. He had a rare quality of leadership which he exhibited in all fields of his endeavors. He was a man of boundless energy, and was unsparing of his time and efforts in any worthy cause.

From early youth, George Shea distinguished himself with honors in his academic work. He was an honor graduate of Westminster Preparatory School. He graduated with honors from Holy Cross College and Yale University Law School, where he was an editor of the Yale Law Journal.

I can think of no more fitting name for the new stadium than the Shea Stadium, in recognition of his successful efforts to make the stadium a reality, and as a richly deserved tribute to one of the District's most outstanding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of George Shea I have lost a dear, loyal, and warm friend. I had very great admiration for Mr. Shea as a distinguished public-spirited gentleman and an able lawyer. Mr. Shea's life was rich with accomplishments beyond his years. George never missed an opportunity to extend a helping hand to a friend and

to encourage those who were troubled. I extend my sympathy to his family.

I earnestly hope that appropriate steps will be taken to name the new stadium the "Shea Stadium" in honor and in memory of George Shea, as suggested by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

CHARLES N. COLLATOS, COMMISSIONER OF VETERANS' SERVICES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND FORMER MASSACHUSETTS LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSIONER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know some of the accomplishments of my able and distinguished constituent, the Commissioner of Veterans' Services of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has a lovely, gracious wife and two sweet children who share honors with him. He is a fine, loyal friend. Starting with the American Legion citation presented to him at a banquet on February 20, 1960.

THE AMERICAN LEGION—CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

"In recognition of outstanding, unselfish, and loyal and continued cooperation rendered to the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, by his years of service to the officers and the members of this organization and to the veterans of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, this certificate is presented to Charles N. Collatos, past department commander and past national executive committeeman, who has exemplified himself as being a trusting servant of the veterans and their dependents and to his fidelity and devotion to the cardinal principles of the American Legion, this testimony expresses the gratitude of the members of this department."

In witness whereof the undersigned have affixed their signatures this 20th day of February in the year of our Lord 1960 and the 41st of the American Legion.

GEORGE K. WALKER,  
Department Commander.  
PETER E. PAPPAS,  
Department Adjutant.

I shall enumerate certain other outstanding achievements:

Commissioner of veterans' services, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Formerly Massachusetts labor relations commissioner, was also national executive committeeman of the American Legion.

First World War II member from Massachusetts.

Past State commander of the American Legion, State of Massachusetts.

Forty years old; married Florence Koniars, formerly of Belmont; two children, Nicholas and Dianne.

Entered service as a private, September 1941; discharged as chief warrant officer, airborne troops, 1945.

Overseas duty: Gliderman—Italy, France, England, Germany, Denmark—

First Airborne Task Force, Allied Airborne Army.

Joined George K. Menichios American Legion Post, No. 324, in 1945, 257 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.; served as first World War II post commander.

Elected as commander, Suffolk County Council, after previous election as senior vice commander, junior vice commander, and executive committeeman.

Elected at 1952 State convention in Gloucester as department vice commander; reelected in 1953 State convention at Lowell as department vice commander.

Elected department commander at State convention in June 1954 at Pittsfield.

Served as State Americanism committee chairman for 2 years.

Member national legislative liaison committee of the American Legion.

Author of "Dangers and Threats of Communist Subversion."

Formerly secretary to Gov. Paul A. Dever, 1948 to 1952.

Massachusetts chairman for Crusade for Freedom Drive; Massachusetts community chairman of Freedom, Inc.

Former publisher of Athens, Greek-American newspaper.

Graduated June 1941 from Northeastern University with A.B. degree.

Active in civic, fraternal, and religious associations.

Member: Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Massachusetts Veterans Services Agents Association, National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs, and other civic, fraternal, and religious organizations.

It is most fitting that Commander Collatos and his family should live in the great historic town of Lexington, Mass.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROLLCALLS ON MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week, as distinguished from quorum calls or rollcalls on rules may go over until Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was that request for Wednesday or just Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### ROLLCALLS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the unanimous-consent request heretofore made that any rollcalls on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week go over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls that might take place on Monday or Tuesday of next week, other than on rules or quorum calls, further consideration of such legislation may be postponed until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts means Thursday. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Massachusetts make his request that rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday instead of Wednesday.

The HALLECK. I cannot agree to that, Mr. Speaker. What is the gentleman's request, may I inquire?

The SPEAKER. The pending request is that any rollcalls except on rules and quorum calls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am afraid that I could not agree to that. I think if rollcalls are not to be had on Monday or Tuesday—and I appreciate the reason for that request, and I certainly shall not object to that, because I am one of those who is interested in the primaries on Tuesday, but I think those votes should come on Wednesday, if there are any votes requested on Monday or Tuesday, and I suggest that the majority leader modify his request.

The SPEAKER. Now, there will be objection to that from the Chair, because the gentleman knows that that will be a good opportunity to ruin Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there are some of us, of course, who are not impressed with the desirability or the necessity of calling anything up on Calendar Wednesday.

I do not know how many rollcall votes there would be on Monday and Tuesday. So far as I can see there will not be any.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my hope and my expectation. I did not want to include any rollcall votes that might take place on Wednesday, if Calendar Wednesday is exercised. That was the reason I did not want to get myself into a complicated position where Calendar Wednesday might be exercised by some Member or Members, and then after we got along a little way, from a practical angle, they might find themselves in a trap as a result of a unanimous-consent request by the majority leader. That is the reason I withdrew my original request and submitted a second one.

I would prefer that any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday, if the gentleman from Indiana is agreeable to that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in view of the Speaker's observation, that he would object to those votes coming on Wednesday instead of Thursday—that is, he would feel constrained himself to object if they came on Wednesday—certainly I do not want to get into the position of embarrassing people who will be away Monday and Tuesday. So, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the unanimous-consent request that as to any rollcalls that might be asked for on Monday and Tuesday, other than those on a rule or a point of no quorum, that further consideration of that legislation be postponed until the following Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### VICTORY OVER THE GAMBLING SYNDICATE IN NEW YORK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a series of articles from the New York Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of submitting a brief report on the tremendous success of my drive against the syndicate and the mafia that have controlled gambling in New York City for the past years. I use as my background first a series of articles that appeared in the New York Post last week in which in the opening article they said this with respect to the drive that I initiated here in Congress in January:

Nobody, not even Thomas E. Dewey, has hit the business as hard as it is hit now.

Also:

At least 60 percent of the bars, stationery stores, groceries, luncheonettes, newsstands, poolrooms, and other protected locations have gone out of the numbers business altogether—at least for now.

The remaining 40 percent of the numbers spots are doing less than half their former business.

The \* \* \* \$2,500 per month for each protected spot \* \* \* has been suspended.

This is the way the series of articles began in the New York Post:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 18, 1960]  
(Article I)

SECOND LOOK AT A RACKET: NUMBERS GAMES  
HARD HIT

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The lush citywide numbers racket, grossing an estimated \$250 million a year here

just 3 months ago, has plummeted to new low depths, a resurvey of the racket by the Post disclosed today.

Six weeks after the Post exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar shakedown racket through which crooked vice squad policemen furnished open protection for policy spots and locations—a fresh look revealed these facts:

At least 60 percent of the bars, stationery stores, groceries, luncheonettes, newsstands, poolrooms, and other protected locations have gone out of the numbers business altogether—at least for now.

The remaining 40 percent of the numbers spots are doing less than half their former business.

The pad itself—under which crooked cops systematically collected an average of \$2,500 per month for each protected spot (even if only an agreed-upon tenement hallway)—has been suspended, temporarily at least, by the racketeering police officials who directed it.

#### THINGS ARE TOUGH ALL OVER

And open warfare has broken out between the longtime numbers barons and those cops who for years were chiefly responsible for the protection and perpetuation of the policy racket.

"Nobody, not even Thomas E. Dewey (ex-racket buster) has hit the business as hard as it is hit now," said one prime source who had helped the Post in its original investigation, touched off by Representative CLAYTON POWELL's charge that police were cooperating with white racketeers—mainly Italian—to drive Negro bankers out of the Harlem business.

"Dewey was out to get Tammany Leader Jimmy Hines, and he got him," the Post source said, "but nothing like this has happened in the 40 years I've known this business. It's tough all the way down."

The Post series, which has been credited with helping the legislature to strengthen existing laws against policy and bookmaking, was only one of several factors in the current crippling of the racket.

Almost simultaneously with the Post publication of the first of 10 articles on the pad last February 29, Presiding Justice John M. Murtagh, assuming his new post in special sessions, began to crack down on the policy operators brought before him.

In the same courtroom where 3 days before 14 policy offenders had walked out free after paying fines from \$25 to \$300 in each case, Murtagh jailed the first six men brought before him—three for 90 days each, one for 6 months and another for 30 days and the sixth for 15 days.

Murtagh also highlighted the operations of certain policy lawyers and the open connection between bondsmen and the organized racket, spurring District Attorney Hogan's continuing investigation into these tieups.

#### AND THAT'S AN ORDER

The top-level order to shut down the pad came with dramatic and unexpected suddenness on March 1, when the second article of the Post series listed the exact sums extorted daily and monthly by crooked cops to let the game operate "legally."

These ranged from the \$2 daily to the cop on the beat on up to the \$300 a month paid to members of each of the top four vice squads in the police department, not to mention the \$625 a month demanded by certain vice squad plainclothesmen in one police division.

One veteran operator, who very recently retired after spending most of his adult life in the policy business, told how he received his orders.

"It was the second day of the Post series," he recalled, "and I hadn't even got a chance to read it before I got the call. The man said simply: 'Everybody's got to close down



until further notice. We don't want nothing from anybody until this blows over, but we don't want to get jammed either. So shut down."

Others told of personal visits by "bag men" and plainclothesmen with the same message. One said:

"The cop who brought me my orders had been scoffing at the whole thing just the day before. He'd bragged that he knew who the Post was going to name in its series, and he said he'd give each one 24 hours' notice before his name appeared so he could make himself scarce. Each man so warned was supposed to kick in an extra taste (additional bribe) for the information."

But two unexpected actions by Police Commissioner Stephen Kennedy, to whom the Post had submitted its series before publication, created panic in the police ranks of the organized racket.

Orders went out to the commanding officers of every vice squad in the city to read each installment of the Post series and to make written reports to police headquarters on any statement in the paper bearing on areas covered by their commands.

A veteran law enforcement official who followed the development said:

"So they panicked. They ordered their men to read the articles too and to increase arrests. They started grabbing everybody indiscriminately, sometimes without a pretense of obtaining legal evidence."

"They started grabbing the repeaters, the hangerson, the 'go for' boys—the guys who go out for aspirin tablets or coffee for the collectors or the controllers. There was nothing of quality in the arrests, but they made up for that in quantity."

Kennedy's second action was even more unexpected. The Commissioner asked the Post to publish daily a special telephone number at police headquarters where informants would be guaranteed anonymity on any tips of corruption on the part of any member of the police force, regardless of rank, and any definite information on policy spots, banks, or drops.

#### RINGING THE BELL

The special telephone number—Canal 6-7500—was first published on March 1, and hundreds of calls poured into police headquarters and were investigated by a special detail established by Kennedy.

Deputy Police Commissioner Walter Arm revealed that during the first month the special line received 352 calls on matters bearing on the policy racket and police corruption in other areas.

These calls resulted in 176 arrests—99 for policy, 61 for disorderly conduct, 9 for book-making, 4 for vagrancy, and 3 for violation of the liquor laws.

Arm said the calls involving accusations of police corruption were referred to Kennedy's undercover squad for investigation. The phone is still in operation, manned by carefully selected superior officers.

One important source in the racket credited this action by Kennedy with driving a real breach between the cops on the pad and the operators they have been shaking down for years.

"Nobody wants to be stoolie," this source said, "but nobody wants to be kicked around without reason either. So when they set up that phone that was the day things blew up."

"For the first time, we had a weapon we could use if the guys got too greedy. If they pushed us around too much in seeking an extra taste, we could always remind them that Mr. KENNEDY might be interested in the whole thing. I don't think any of us ever dreamed that we could one day stand up for our rights by threatening to use a solitary dime."

The Post resurvey indicated that the major outlets in the citywide racket—most of

them controlled by the East Harlem mob—actually did suspend operations for several days, and many are still out.

But although the pad was temporarily suspended as an organized agency of graft, some corruption is believed to continue on a more chaotic scale. And the numbers racket, itself, of course, continues, but on a greatly reduced scale at the moment.

#### THE COOL VIEW

Chaos resulted, one source said, when several of the bolder vice squad plainclothesmen immediately sought to set up individual pads and make their own collections.

"They came around in teams of two and demanded \$15 a man each week," this source said, "but most of the men ain't kicking in."

The source reported the reaction of an unidentified numbers banker.

"When they came to me [the banker], I told them we were cooling it like the orders said. And when they kept on hinting that we had better kick in or something would happen, I told them frankly:

"If you catch me right, I'll take my medicine. But if you frame me or any of my people, or tell me I got to give you somebody to make your quota, then I'll go straight to Murtagh or Hogan and I'll spill my guts." I told them I ain't going to take no 6 months in jail for nobody."

I would like to point out also that nearly everything that I fought for here during January and February has been achieved.

The State legislature passed a new gambling law, signed by Governor Rockefeller, which now makes mandatory a prison sentence for repeaters after the second conviction.

The grand jury of Manhattan, under District Attorney Frank Hogan, is now sitting in session.

The State Crime Commission under Mr. Goodman Sacharand of Rochester, N.Y., is now staging an investigation.

The police commissioner has reorganized Manhattan into two districts rather than the many it had before.

The entire confidential squad of the police commissioner of New York City has been busted and a new one was sworn in yesterday.

However, I wish to state that beginning the last of May I will start again on Wednesdays putting into the RECORD any items that I find or are given to me by citizens which indicate there is any going back to the good old days of New York City Police Department payola or any whitewashing or covering up by any agency of government—county, city, State, or Federal.

Mr. Speaker, the articles to which I referred earlier are as follows:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 19, 1960]

#### (Article II)

#### HOW THE COURT CRACKDOWN HIT THE POLICY RACKET

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

A simple weapon which has been available to the courts here for decades is inflicting more damage on the \$250-million-a-year numbers racket than all the antipolicy crusades of the last half century.

The weapon? Stiff sentences instead of fines. Presiding Justice Murtagh of special sessions started slamming the jail doors on convicted policy defendants in Gamblers Part last February 29—simultaneous with the Post's exposé of the pad, the multi-million-dollar protection racket operated by

crooked vice squad cops to let the numbers barons go unmolested.

Prosecutors and grand juries for years had been demanding jail sentences for gamblers instead of the traditional slap-on-the-wrist fines.

Back on November 12, 1958, District Attorney Hogan protested publicly when General Sessions Judge Marks suspended sentences on 13 of the biggest Italian policy barons after all had pleaded guilty to a numbers game conspiracy indictment. Hogan has always viewed jail terms as one of the most potent weapons in combating policy.

"There are thousands of such arrests (policy) each year," he complained recently, "but they all almost invariably result in a suspended sentence or a fine."

And the Brooklyn rackets grand jury, backing District Attorney Silver's own views reported last year:

"The bookmakers and policy bankers consider these court proceedings which result so often in fines as merely part of the cost of doing business—as a sort of 'license' fee."

"Bookmakers and policy operators are soft livers. Nothing, but nothing like a jail sentence could teach them that violating our laws is serious. As the police often put it: 'these bums don't like jail.'"

Court records compiled by Post reporters both in its original exposé of the links between crooked plainclothesmen and policy racketeers, and in its current followup on the situation, give substance to the jury's charges.

Of the 2,885 persons arraigned in the magistrates' courts for policy law violations in January and February, this year (while Murtagh was then chief magistrate, ironically), only 3 were given jail sentences. And none of these three—two in Manhattan and one in Queens—received as much as 30 days.

Of the 2,885, 239 pleaded guilty in magistrates court and were fined or given suspended sentences. The vast majority, represented by bondsmen and lawyers whose fees were paid by the syndicate behind policy, merely waived their cases to gamblers part of special sessions. There most of them were discharged on their own recognizance or fined \$25 to \$300 each on their routine pleas of guilty. The syndicate promptly paid the fines and most of these offenders never lost a day's work in the racket.

#### MURTAGH "LOWERS THE BOOM"

Then, on February 29, to use the words of one of his later victims, "that cat Murtagh came on like Gang Busters."

Without warning, the new presiding justice jailed up to 6 months the first six policy offenders brought before him in gambling part.

When Isaac Ingham, 71, a lowly runner, admitted under questioning from the bench that he knew neither the name of the bondsman who bailed him out nor the lawyer who showed up to represent him, Murtagh indignantly called for an investigation by District Attorney Hogan of the alliance between the policy syndicates and the bondsmen and lawyers. Murtagh threatened to drive such lawyers from special sessions and referred the names of two lawyers to Hogan's office.

Some critics of police corruption and policy protection were unimpressed as Murtagh continued his crusade on March 3 by sending 13 men to jail for 15 days to 6 months each and 12 more to jail the next day for a flat 6 months.

"These men are all small fry," these "cuties" charged, "there isn't a numbers banker in the lot."

But the policy operators themselves had no such illusions.

"That's like saying the enemy shot your army to pieces but didn't lay a hand on the general," one commented the other day.

"A banker without runners and controllers is as helpless as a general without troops."

The more realistic reaction in the racket had been expressed by one defendant that first day when he saw six men go to jail before him.

"Man, get me an adjournment," he had whispered desperately to his lawyer, "that guy up there on that bench is crazy."

So, as Murtagh jailed 43 offenders in his first 5 days while revoking the bonds and issuing arrest warrants for 14 others who fearfully failed to appear, the syndicate shifted its operations back to the magistrates' courts and insisted that its men be tried there.

But they underestimated the situation, for while the bonding companies suddenly started demanding \$250 cash surety for each policy arrest (instead of the usual \$50 to be split between the syndicate's bondsman and lawyer), Murtagh was busy on another front.

He called a conference with his lower court successor, Chief Magistrate Abraham M. Block, and Administrative Magistrate Larry M. Vetrano and mapped the next line of attack.

The result became evident last March 28 when Larry Melville, 54, a socially prominent Harlem operator who had never spent a day in jail despite six previous policy convictions, came up in magistrates' court on a routine charge.

#### "NO HIDING PLACE"

Magistrate James E. LoPiccolo immediately slapped Melville with the stiffest sentence passed out so far—6 months in jail and 30 days more unless he paid a \$500 fine immediately.

One Harlem operator recalled that moment the other day in these words:

"When they lowered the boom on Larry like that, we knew at last there was no hiding place. We were boxed in on both ends."

And the walls were closing in from two other sides at the same time.

Hogan stepped up his investigation of alliances between lawyers, bondsmen, and policy racketeers by flooding the town with subpoenas. Veteran policy lawyers, faced with possible bar association investigation, started shunning such cases, leaving many defendants without counsel.

The list of defendants skyrocketed further as Police Commissioner Kennedy, aroused by the Post exposé of police corruption and policy protection, applied unprecedented heat to all the vice squad commands.

Policy arrests increased from 3,928 for the first 3 months of 1959 to a total of 4,280 for January, February, and March of this year. Only Staten Island failed to show an increase for the 3-month period.

While the overall increase in policy arrests was only 352 cases, a longtime operator interpreted the figures in this way for the Post:

"The difference is that these arrests this year—especially in March—were for real. Last year, you could figure that half of the numbers arrests were just 'accommodation cases'—you know, winos and junkies whom you paid \$50 each to take a bust and help the cops keep their quota.

"But who the hell is going to agree to take 6 months in jail for a lousy \$50? Not even a junkie. Maybe a junkie least of all. So the cops, to cover themselves, are grabbing the regular guys who are the backbone of the business. Even guys they've been collecting for years.

"And if a bank can't take care of a regular guy's family for the 60 days or 6 months he's in jail, what is to keep that guy from spilling his guts to Murtagh or even Hogan?"

Another long-time operator discussed the matter from a different angle.

"No matter what the Post or anyone else says," he observed, "the vast majority of people in the numbers business are not racketeers. Many are quite respectable, church members, people who are often looked up to in their immediate communities.

"From habit and background, many of these people have handled a few numbers as a means of supplementing their regular job incomes. Even if they got arrested in the past—and that didn't happen often—they could be arraigned in court, fined, released, and nobody knew anything about it.

"But how many of them do you think will continue when they knew they may go to jail now and be disgraced before their families and their neighbors? This thing is going to cost the game several thousands of such part-time workers, not to mention many guys who never did anything else."

Our harassed policy operator asked the inevitable question:

"What got into this Murtagh? He didn't act up when he was chief magistrate. Now he's giving us hell all over the lot."

A fellow operative answered the question with a shrug.

"I don't know what got into him," he remarked despairingly, "but he sure as hell got into us."

[From the New York Post, Apr. 20, 1960]  
(Article III)

#### BARE NEW RACKET IN RECORDS—HARLEM 'POLICY' HARDEST HIT—OTHER BANKS STILL STRONG

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The three-way squeeze which has reduced the policy racket to its lowest ebb here, following the Post's revelations of links between police and the numbers barons, has hit the Harlem game harder than elsewhere in the city.

While Queens and Staten Island policy banks apparently have continued to flourish on about the same scale, despite the Post's exposé of the multimillion-dollar vice squad protection system, the new drive by Police Commissioner Kennedy, Presiding Special Sessions Justice Murtagh and District Attorney Hogan is driving much of Harlem's game underground and biting into the play in Brooklyn and the Bronx.

In Brooklyn, arrests are up over 10 percent because special attention is being paid to the "spots" and "locations" which paid an average of \$2,500 a month to grafting vice squad cops for the privilege of operating openly before the Post exposed The Pad, the list of protected policy places.

Angel F. Calder, the city's largest Puerto Rican policy banker, has given up his extensive Brooklyn operation as a result of his long running fight with District Attorney Silver, compounded by the heat the Post series generated.

#### SMALL CHANGE

Calder, who is still awaiting trial with his minions on charges growing out of Silver's spectacular 1958 raid on his \$5 million Brooklyn bank, is now conducting a much more limited operation, reputedly from a store on Second Avenue in Manhattan.

Most of his former controllers and collectors in Brooklyn have been absorbed by the East Harlem mob's Kings County operation, directed by Mike Miranda.

But the East Harlem syndicate which controls most of the policy business in all boroughs has also accepted the temporary shutdown of the pad in Brooklyn—on the frightened orders of the crooked vice squad cops who run the protection system.

In the Bronx the syndicate's operation, still run in absentia by Sammy Schlitz (Schlitten), has also been hit, but not so hard, by a 10-percent rise in arrests following a suspension of the pad.

But although his basic Bronx-wide operation remains in fairly good shape, waiting only word of the reestablishment of the pad to swing back in action, persons associated with Schlitz told Post reporters that the dapper little ex-bootlegger and juke box czar is smarting over the shutdown of five of the seven lucrative spots for which he paid heavy police protection in Harlem.

First to go, in the wake of the Post exposé, was the modest headquarters which three Schlitz henchmen, known as Mel, Artie, and Solie, maintained in a tenement hallway on 145th Street. All three disappeared March 1—the day the pad was ordered suspended—and haven't been seen there since.

Three other Schlitz locations closed down the next day. His last two remaining spots are run by two men known as Dave and Sutton on West 144th Street in what is known as the last wide open block in Harlem. Both Schlitz minions patrol the block more closely than the cop on the beat, but pickings were still slim there last week.

But Schlitz, although undisputed policy czar of the Bronx, is only a minor operator in the lush Harlem game which the East Harlem syndicate has been consolidating over a number of years.

And his losses, while substantial, are small compared to the major Italian banks which still control most of the business in the predominantly Negro community.

Here's what the Post resurvey indicated happened to other major Harlem operators:

Anthony (Punchy) Salerno, director of the Syndicate's citywide policy operations and most powerful figure in the Harlem policy game, had 37 "wide open spots" for which he paid grafting cops an estimated \$100,000 a month before the crackdown. The Post found only about 12 of the 37 spots in operation last week. This does not mean that Salerno is out of the business, however. As one of his former associates pointed out:

"Many of the guys who acted as controllers in the candy stores, tailor shops, groceries, bars and other spots run by Tony are still in the business. They just don't operate out of stores any more. They got together many of the runners the Negro bankers had when the shutdown came, and they collect their business and turn it in.

"And in many ways, this isn't a bad deal for Punchy. He still saves the \$45,000 a month which he had to get together for the three vice squads about the division level, while he is by no means starving from the 'controlling' business which is keeping his game going."

Other Post sources reported that another major Italian operation in Harlem—the Vigilante brothers, Louis, Tony, and Charlie—went one step further.

#### ORDERS IS ORDERS

"When the order came down on March 1 that the pad was closed and no payments expected," one said, "the Vigilantes really went underground, although they continued to work the same 'controlling' business as Tony.

"But when the cops, as most of them did after 2 or 3 days, came around and wanted to establish individual pads, Louis Vigilante would have no part of it.

"You ordered us to quit and we've quit," he is said to have told these cops, "we ain't giving nobody nothing." The cops knew he was lying, but what could they do about it? Those East Harlem boys carry too much weight."

Also hard hit by the suspension of the pad was Louis (Louie The Gimp) Avitable, the Lenox Avenue supermarket owner whom Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL had called the top man in the syndicate's Harlem operations.

Avitable, despite the pressure put on him by POWELL, still had 14 spots for which he paid monthly protection when the Post ex-



posé was printed. Last week these 14 spots were down to 4.

His main spot then was in a basement around the corner from his supermarket (a raided premises since last July 2), operated by Solly Appuzzo, the Gimp's partner. Last week that basement was only an obscure policy drop, and neither Solly nor Louie have been seen in the neighborhood recently.

Another Italian operation—the Lenox Avenue bank operated by Felice and James Falca—came up with a new idea when the heat went on. The Falcas, who called themselves Phil and Jim Black, offered to sell shares in their bank to hard-pressed Negro policy bankers if the price would be met. Negotiations are still continuing, although neither brother has been seen recently in his usual Harlem hangout.

#### ON THE RUN

But if the syndicate's large white banks have been hard hit by the crackdown, the few remaining Negro bankers have suffered even more—although few of the Negro operators had been able to afford full pad payments even before the system was exposed.

Here is what happened to most of them: Henry Lawrence, long regarded as one of only two Negroes who had enough influence with the crooked vice squad cops to OK another Negro for the pad, fled to his native Kingston, Jamaica, soon after he was ordered to cease operations from his upper Eighth Avenue tailor shop. Lawrence suffered a heart attack in Jamaica and is now hospitalized there.

Lawrence's Puerto Rican partner, Spanish Raymond Marquez, who operated several of their bank's 10 protected spots on the lower part of Eighth Avenue, also disappeared—but not before police raided the bar and grill he owns near 112th Street and stationed a patrolman there.

Ironically no such action had been taken on August 17, 1958, when police seized Marquez' brother, John, 27, and 12 companions in the same bar and stripped them of 4 revolvers and 2 dismantled rifles.

#### BANK ROBBERY

The arsenal had been assembled just a few hours earlier, after Spanish Raymond had shot to death David Peters, 28, a young Negro hoodlum who had been muscling in on the Lawrence-Marquez numbers business in the area. Marquez claimed self-defense and was not indicted for the killing.

With police protection no longer assured, several of the Negro bankers fell prey to youthful holdup men who had learned by bitter experience—and a few gangland-type killings—not to mess with the syndicate's Harlem operations.

The big three bank of Carlyle Williams, Walter Smith, and Crip Martin in the 127th Street and Lenox Avenue area was held up twice, with the bandits taking \$1,800 in cash on their second trip. Simultaneously, the same young gang tried to break into Smith's apartment in Washington Heights but was thwarted in the attempt.

Fritz Devinish, who with Boo Marshall, Sid Thompson, Pat Hogan, and Crappy Hale, operated as the Big Five in the 140's block off Lennox Avenue, was called in by Immigration officials for questioning, and the whole bank closed down completely for a month. It has since reopened limited operations.

A young Negro who amassed a fortune by serving a scant 8 or 9 years as a vice squad plainclothesman was called in for questioning in Hogan's current investigation—but not before he had been summoned to conferences with his former vice squad colleagues after his operations had been mentioned in the Post series.

And the end is not in sight.

"Even when things open up again, and they will," one of the Negro operators said, "I don't think we'll ever get back to where we were. If ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was a little premature in saying that the whites were taking over all of the Harlem business 3 months ago, he won't be premature when the pad is reestablished in the near future."

[From the New York Post, Apr. 21, 1960]

#### (Article IV)

GUARD RECORD RACKET WITNESSES; POLICY MEN HOPE FOR COMEBACK

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The numbers game has been hard hit by the current crackdowns but many people in the racket persist in the belief that it will come back strong again, and with police collaboration. Post reporters kept running into this view as they resurveyed the policy situation.

Thousands of numbers runners—low men on the totem pole—are scuffling desperately each day to hold the shambles together in the hope that the antipolicy drive will run its course and be forgotten.

A member of the Post team which exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar vice squad protection racket—6 weeks ago, retraced his steps last week to see how the operation was faring under the combined heat of the police and the courts. Here is his report:

"Toured Harlem today with the same numbers operator as before. The plan now as then was to introduce me as his nephew and engage various numbers writers in conversation.

#### STREET SCENE

"If the plan didn't work out better, blame the cops. The streets are flooded with them. Not just the patrolmen. You can't go a block without seeing police radio cars, cruising or just parked in front of bars or stores.

"In every other block, my guide, who knows them on sight, pointed out the unmarked cars of plainclothesmen. The cops know him, of course, so we had to pass by the first three places where we were supposed to stop; plainclothesmen or radio cops were parked there.

"We finally hit a bar on Amsterdam Avenue and started talking to a numbers writer he knew. This guy has a real problem. For him, the couple of blocks between his home and this bar is a kind of no man's land.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 22, 1960]

#### (Article V)

"POLICY": A HOUSE DIVIDED

(By Ted Poston, with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

Just 6 weeks ago Javon B. Hunter, 25, formerly of 242 West 148th Street, was a numbers runner who turned his daily book over to William (Shorty) Greer, 36, a controller for Felice and James Falca's Lenox Avenue policy bank.

Today, J. B., as his hundreds of numbers customers knew him, is dead, and Greer is in The Tombs charged with the slaying.

Both, in a way, are victims of the chaos which has descended on the policy racket since the Post exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar protection racket operated by crooked vice cops—and Presiding Justice Murtagh started throwing jail terms at the small-fry sinews of the numbers industry.

Their story is only one of a score of similar incidents—more violent than most—encountered by Post reporters in their follow-up investigation of the numbers racket.

Here's what happened:

When Police Commissioner Kennedy cracked down on the vice squad corruption ring on the heels of the Post's exposures, the Falco brothers (who called themselves Phil and Jim Black) tried to sell shares in their

lucrative policy bank. But when the crooked cops themselves ordered them and other bankers to suspend operations while the heat was on, the Falcos took off.

Greer, like scores of controllers all over the city, was left high and dry, so he took part-time work as a bartender in a Seventh Avenue gin mill and continued to accept the "books" turned in to him daily by his veteran numbers collectors.

Not until an unlucky hit came up on March 28 did J. B. find that Shorty hadn't been turning his bets over to a bank and thus couldn't pay off. J. B. went to the bar and beat up not only Shorty but the white owner of the place as well. Shorty finally routed him with a baseball bat.

The two met again early in the next morning, March 29, in the Beverly Hills Bar and Grill, 303 West 145th Street. The fight was resumed, and minutes later J. B. slumped to the floor, dying of stab wounds. Shorty was seized on homicide charges.

Greer was indicted for second-degree murder last Thursday, and is being held in \$20,000 bail for pleading next week. He had been convicted of policy violations seven times and was fined \$350 for running a policy drop on October 6, 1956.

This is only one incident in the fresh internecine warfare among minor policy operators. But there is a more bitter if less bloody conflict going on between the policy bankers themselves and the still-grafting cops who insist on "getting a taste" (bribe money) despite the orders of some of their superiors to "cool it for a while."

One veteran source described it this way. "These guys who have been on the take so long just refuse to reduce their new standard of living, heat or no heat. One of them said his plainclothesman salary wasn't enough to meet the fixed charges of his monthly expenses.

"He said he had no intention of losing his Cadillac or putting his second old lady out of her Sugar Hill apartment while waiting for the pad to be revived. So he told everybody that he expected to get his as usual every week or he'd bust (arrest) everybody in sight."

Some of the newly impoverished plainclothesmen went even further. In one case, a plainclothesman trailed a known pickup man for a hard-pressed Manhattan bank and seized him along with 50 envelopes containing that day's "works" (the betting action). Such "high-jackings" were not unusual even when collaboration between the cops and the banks was wide open, before the Post series. The usual practice was to call up the bank and demand a "\$50 taste" for releasing the "works" before the close of the day's business.

"But the free-booting b— in this case," a reliable source told the Post, "had the nerve to call the bank manager and demand \$1,500 just for the 'works.'"

#### STALEMATE

"The manager told him he was crazy, but they kept on bargaining over the phone until the manager said he might come up with \$500 if both his pick-up man and the 'works' were released immediately.

"But this free-booter said: 'Oh, no; your man has got to take a bust. After all, I've got to meet my quota.' The manager told him to go to hell, but the cop reminded him:

"If you'll up the ante, I might try to do something. But if you let your man get busted and if Murtagh decides to give him 6 months, he may decide to blow the whistle on you."

"The manager really blew his stack then and reminded the cop that he could blow a whistle, too—just by calling that Canal 6-7500 special number which Commissioner Kennedy had set up for tips on crooked cops.

"This set up a sort of stalemate before they finally worked out something. I don't know how much was paid, but the 'works' were returned in time for that day's tabulations."

A somewhat similar incident was reported in the Bronx, where the drive against policy and corruption hasn't hit as hard as it has in Manhattan and Brooklyn.

[Antipolicy activity is even less evident in Queens, where numbers arrests rose only from 271 for the first 3 months of 1959 to just 279 for the same period this year. It is practically nonexistent in Staten Island, where only 11 policy arrests were made all last January, February, and March—a drop of 3 from the 14 arrests made during the same period in 1959.]

The Bronx incident had a fresh angle, as explained by a Post source there.

"When the Pad closed down in early March, everything went on a catch-as-catch-can basis," the source said. "Then everybody tried to get in the act. And this included many cops who had never been on the Pad."

He then cited the case of a numbers operator who was picked up 2 weeks ago by three detectives from the narcotics squad.

"Now this man had never had nothing to do with narcotics and these cops knew it. As a matter of fact, they weren't even in their assigned areas when they put the arm on him."

"But what could he do? They knew he was in the numbers and they knew he had money on him. And he was afraid that if he didn't get away he might find something put in his pocket before he got to the station house."

"So he finally got up \$400 and they let him go."

A more common complaint in most boroughs is that, in their anxiety to build up their arrest records, some shady vice squad policemen are, in the words of a respected law-enforcement official, "making indiscriminate arrests without . . . obtaining legal evidence."

#### A FRIENDLY WAVE

Fausto Diaz, a \$56-a-week busboy at the Prince George Hotel, 14 East 28th Street, came to the Post from his home at 370 Bushwick Avenue, Brooklyn, to charge that he had been framed in one such case last March 9—the day before the 10-part Post series on police corruption and policy protection ended.

Diaz said he was walking down the street to the subway to report for his regular 4 p.m. shift at the hotel when he saw a friend, Raphael Pagan, of 60 Moore Street, Brooklyn, sitting in a car on the other side of the street.

"I waved at him as I usually did and kept on walking," he said, "when suddenly a detective grabbed me and another grabbed Raphael across the street. He searched me right there on the street, and then they took both of us up to Raphael's apartment, where they searched us both again. They didn't find anything on either one of us, but they booked us both for policy."

Inspector William Kimmins of the Brooklyn East Patrol Bureau denied Diaz' charges. He said that Detectives Henry O'Brien and George Levine said they had made the arrests in Pagan's apartment and that Diaz had one policy slip in his pocket and had flushed another down the toilet. Kimmins also pointed out that Pagan had three previous policy convictions. Diaz had never been arrested before.

Diaz, finally released on \$1,000 bail bond which cost him \$50 plus \$35 for a lawyer, rejected the police contention and produced what he felt was clinching evidence of his innocence.

He exhibited three dog-eared installment charge books to show that he owed almost

\$1,000 in bills for household fixtures and furniture.

"If I was in the rackets, and was making money from numbers," he asked, "then how would I be owing this kind of money?"

"And I'll probably owe more now and fall behind in my payments, for I've already lost three day's pay just for waving to a friend on my way to work."

Diaz had been scheduled for trial in magistrates' court last March 31, but—unlike many policy veterans recently—he waived his hearing for a trial later in special sessions, preferring to take his chances with Murtagh.

Some old hands in the game who heard of his story saw in this some evidence of his innocence or inexperience in the game.

"Any cat these days who will take a chance of coming up before Murtagh," one observed, "must be pure in heart—or just aching to serve 6 months in the workhouse."

"I got to figure the man is innocent."

#### COMMISSION ON EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Commission to be known as the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. It is identical to the bill introduced earlier in the 86th Congress by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] on behalf of the administration.

Our colleagues will recall that, during the recent debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the Chair sustained a point of order raised against an amendment to that legislation which was designed to create the proposed Commission. The House voted to uphold the ruling of the Chair that the amendment was not germane to the bill under consideration.

Now that the civil rights bill has been disposed of, Mr. Speaker, there can be no procedural objection standing in the way of early consideration of this proposal. I have introduced the bill to emphasize the urgency I feel about taking effective action in this important area of civil rights. Like many of our colleagues, I was disappointed that the civil rights bill, as enacted, was so limited in scope, that it failed to provide any measure of protection for civil rights other than voting rights—rights, for instance, in the fields of education, housing and employment. The present bill would deal with the last field by providing a statutory basis for the important work of the existing President's Committee on Government Contracts.

While it has become, perhaps, somewhat shopworn to say that "the world watches America," it is a statement which is nonetheless true and of great significance. In the never-ceasing struggle between the closed societies, which would subvert the dignity of man to the wishes of the state, and the open societies, which hold that each individual possesses certain fundamental rights regardless of the wishes of the state, the people of Africa, South America, Asia, and even Europe are watching the two great representatives of these conflicting

ideologies: political and economic freedom represented by the United States, and political and economic statism and imperialism represented by the Soviet Union.

For the uncommitted and impoverished peoples, who quite literally do not know where their next meal is coming from and who live under conditions of permanent economic privation, the choice between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is not quite so simple or so black-and-white as it appears to us. They wonder if state control will also rapidly lift them to the levels enjoyed by their wealthier neighbors in the world. Some are even tempted to postpone concern for political freedom until economic gains have been made.

We understand, however, from the vantage point of experience, that full stomachs can never be enough. Men need more than full dinner pails as they live their lives on earth. We recognize that we are engaged not only in a competition of weapons and economies, but also in one for the spirits and minds of men.

As we pursue this competition, as we struggle to preserve and strengthen freedom throughout the world, we must remember that four-fifths of the world's population is composed of people whose skins are darker than ours. For these people, the question of racial discrimination is of primary importance—equal, certainly, to their quest for more of the world's goods. It is inevitable, therefore, that the leaders of the new nations of Africa, for example, should look at America to see how we practice the freedom we preach—especially as it involves our relations with those fellow citizens whose ancestors were also their ancestors.

With their eyes upon us, what can we say?

Can we tell them that when a Negro worker becomes unemployed he is usually out of work much longer than his white counterpart?

Can we tell them—people who place so high a value on a university education—that in the lower level laboring and service jobs in our country there are, proportionately, five times as many Negro men with college training as there are white men with similar educations?

What shall we say to those who inquire? Shall we tell them that tax revenues, to which all our people contribute, can be used to enrich some of our people who would in turn discriminate against others among our people?

We have an opportunity in this session of Congress to give an answer that will be heard around the world. This bill would provide for a 15-man Equal Job Opportunity Commission and authorize the Commission to "implement the policy of the U.S. Government to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in the employment of persons in the performance of contracts or subcontracts to provide the Government with goods or services."

The means to be used would be education; the aim, voluntary compliance rather than arbitrary coercion. The



problem is to educate to their responsibilities those of our fellow citizens who are engaged in employing people to work on contracts to provide goods or services to the Government.

The results—we can be confident—will be a better utilization of America's human resources in a time of great need and, more important, a wider recognition throughout the world that here in America the efforts and abilities of all our people are recognized on their own merits, that here in America freedom is more than a word.

All around us, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the inevitable fruits of generations of discrimination—in the newly emerging nations of the world and in those still dominated by colonialism, as well as in our own South—results which have been predicted for many years. Everywhere, men are striving to secure the freedom they have never known: personal, political and economic freedom—freedoms which to an unusual extent they conceive of in the same terms as did our forefathers.

In some cases, violence is the tragic means to which they have resorted. In other instances—notably in our own South—the struggle for full freedom is being conducted with patience, restraint and dignity.

Throughout our history as a Nation, we have equated our destiny with our devotion to freedom. We are challenged now as never before to make of our devotion to freedom a living and meaningful force for good.

I hope this House will continue to implement its historic commitment to freedom by taking affirmative action during this session on legislation which will help to assure for all people their right to fair play and equal consideration in seeking employment under Government contracts.

#### DAY-CARE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, among the many social changes which occurred in America during the 1950's was a great increase in the number of working mothers. Today there are more mothers working than in any previous time in our history. Their number, in fact has doubled since 1950.

More than 2,875,000 mothers are now working full time who have over 5,073,000 children under 12 years of age. Nearly 400,000 of these children under 12 have to care for themselves since there are no other arrangements for them. This is a national situation which the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has termed "alarming."

The Bureau pulled no punches in a recent release in stating that—

Any community should be alarmed that young children under 12 have to fend for themselves while their mothers work.

The dimensions of the situation and its serious implications for family life and the healthy development of the chil-

dren are potent arguments for the consideration of programs to provide adequate care for these youngsters. I am a cosponsor of the bill introduced by Senator JAVRS to create a system of Federal grants to the States on a matching basis for the establishment of day-care centers for these "latch key" children. It is not a new concept. The Lanham Act passed in the early 1940's set up such a program but it was allowed to lapse after the close of World War II. The need for the program today is even greater than during those war years when it was so successful.

The unfortunate fact is that once the Federal Government discontinued its participation in this effective day-care program, the States and localities which shared the expenses of the centers on a matching basis also discontinued their own responsibility in the field. Despite continued appeals, the States and localities have failed to keep up the day-care programs, because, they charge, Federal financial aid has ceased. Another reason given is the lack of knowledge and the lack of availability of professionally trained personnel to staff the centers. It is obvious, therefore, that Federal leadership is needed.

Under the bill, Federal grants for this purpose, not to exceed \$12,500,000, would be provided on a matching basis to States which have initiated day-care center plans which have been approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such plans would provide for careful screening and only those children for whom no better plan could be made would be eligible. There would be a very careful check of the income of the family and the fee to the parents would be determined on the basis of the ability to pay.

The other half of the Federal funds would be administered to "impacted" areas in which specific Federal activities like defense work or military bases have created a special need for such facilities.

This is a cheap investment, yet one that will pay unquestionable dividends. Many communities are anxious to initiate programs but need the support and encouragement of the Federal Government. They are beginning to realize the value of skilled day care, not only to the child but to the family. For the child it provides a happy growing experience in safe surroundings during hours when parents must be absent. For families, day care often makes life together possible, both physically and emotionally. Day-care keeps families together and strengthens family life.

Modern day-care costs money. In New York City, for example, it totals about \$1,000 per child per year. Large as this may seem, it is cheap when compared with the cost of family breakup and juvenile delinquency.

I urge that the Congress take every action to enact this needed legislation during this session.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the members of the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file additional views to accompany Report No. 1556 on the bill H.R. 9070 and to become a part thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AS TO PICKETING TO PROTEST SUBSTANDARD CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Committee on Education and Labor voted by an impressive 21 to 5 to report a very simple but very important measure to the floor. This measure will correct some of the worst injustices of what is known as section 8(b) (4) (B) of the National Labor Relations Act.

The bill is H.R. 9070.

I was very happy to have the privilege of introducing this bill. I wish to commend the very large majority of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for their wisdom and understanding in reporting this bill. It is my hope that the House will follow this example set by the committee and will take prompt and favorable action on this bill when it comes time for a vote. When that time comes I will regard it as a pleasant duty, to help guide this bill on its legislative journey to the statute books.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to make a few advance remarks on the issues raised by this bill because of certain misimpressions as to this measure. I think that, in view of these misimpressions, it would be helpful to other members of this house to have a clear presentation on what this bill is about.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill, it adds a simple proviso to section 8(b) (4) (B)—no more than 10 new lines to the present law. It has a simple purpose; namely, to correct a legal technicality which outlaws a picket line appealing to all building tradesmen working together on a common construction project to protest substandard conditions maintained by any one of the contractors on the job.

Some time ago, in 1951, it was ruled by the Supreme Court that, because building tradesmen jointly engaged in a construction job at the very same site were technically employed by separate contractors, then these men could not picket in protest when nonunion workers were brought on the job by one of the contractors to work side by side with union men at substandard wages and substandard hours of work. This ruling came in what is known as the *Denver Building Trades Case* (341 U.S. 675).

This decision came as a distinct shock to every union member in the construction industry. A brief look at the realities of this industry will show why.

Buildings or projects are rarely designed and built by one firm or company. Instead, they are usually the combined product of many separate contractors in the same industry, working together as one team.

Very frequently it is the general contractor who must weld these contractors and their workers together into one smoothly functioning group, so that the whole project may be completed at the least possible cost and in the quickest possible time.

Despite these close relationships legal differences persist. Each contractor is a separate entity. Each separately employs his own labor. Workmen jointly engaged on the same project at the same time may be employed by as many as a dozen separate and distinct but functionally closely related employers. In the construction industry these conditions are due to what Mr. Justice Douglas aptly describes in the Denver case as "fortuitous business arrangements that have no significance so far as the evils of the secondary boycott are concerned."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, these fortuitous arrangements do have significance today as a direct result of the Denver case. Let us suppose, for a moment, that, instead of farming out the electrical work, the general contractor in the Denver case decided to do it himself.

As pointed out in the dissent in the Denver case:

The picketing would undoubtedly have been legal if there had been no subcontractor involved—if the general contractor had put union men on the job. The presence of the subcontractor does not alter one whit the realities of the situation; the protest of the union is precisely the same.

In another sense these fortuitous arrangements of the construction industry are not fortuitous at all, that is, the choice of subcontractors is usually no accident. Before a general contractor can submit a bid on a construction job, he must secure bids on work he usually subcontracts, such as, plumbing, heating, and electrical installation. The success of the job may well depend upon the integrity and know-how of these subcontractors.

Who the subcontractor is, how he will do the job, and what he will charge are vital questions, to which not only the general contractor but often even the owner must have satisfying answers. In fact, the owner or architect frequently require the general contractor to list his subcontractors in submitting his bid. Frequently, the general contractor cannot change subcontractors without approval from the owner or architect.

One of the prime considerations in selecting a subcontractor is the nature and source of his labor supply. Does he employ skilled craftsmen? Can he get well qualified men to do the work? Does he secure men pursuant to an agreement with a building trades union? Here again the answers to these questions can mean the difference between success and failure on the job. The presence or absence of a collective agreement with a building trades union can mean the difference between stormy and harmonious industrial relations on the job.

In his turn, the subcontractor must also know the answers to these questions because they also affect his ability to perform.

Consequently, these contractors have made their commitments with their eyes open. Long before they move into the jobsite they know or have a full opportunity to know whether union and non-union men are going to be thrown together on the jobsite, and whether trouble will be the product of this mixed marriage.

No one can be taken by surprise in these situations. No one can claim damage without advance warning and the chance to avoid damage. No one is neutral. No one is "an innocent bystander." Every one is well aware of the probable consequences of his own course of action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, an axiom in the law of secondary boycotts is that they are prohibited to protect neutrals and innocent bystanders, who may become the unwitting victims of industrial strife.

To take a clear case, a factory maintains fair working conditions under a union agreement. It has contracted to buy the products of another firm which also maintains good conditions under a union agreement. But times change. The second firm's labor policies change. Disputes arise. A strike breaks out. Then the union sends some of its striking members over to picket the factory, because it is installing the other firm's products. This is a classic secondary boycott.

When the Taft-Hartley Act became law, the late distinguished Senator who was one of its authors, Senator Taft, clearly stated that section 8(b)(4)(B) was to save innocent bystanders, such as the factory owner in this case, from harm in a dispute which he could not foresee or prevent or avoid without serious personal loss. Here is what the Senator said, at CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, page 4198:

This provision makes it unlawful to resort to a secondary boycott to injure the business of a third person who is wholly unconnected in the disagreement between an employer and his employees.

And I also found, on going over the record in the Senate on that act debated 13 years ago, that almost every reference to boycotts involved plant and retail situations, one employer handling the products of another. None of the proponents of what is now section 8(b)(4)(B) talked about the construction industry or common situs picketing on construction jobs.

Contractors and subcontractors in the construction industry are never wholly unconcerned in a disagreement resulting from nonunion labor showing up at the construction project. In fact they have usually brought this very situation about and as joint venturers, they must share the burden of their own conduct. Yet despite these facts and the obvious purpose of the Taft Act's sponsors, the Denver case has removed this burden from their shoulders.

These and other injustices of the Denver case become all the more apparent

when we compare construction work and manufacturing.

Contract construction and manufacturing are as different as night and day. Manufacturing is performed in a plant where workers are steadily and regularly employed at one place day after day. Contract construction is performed in any place where somebody wants something built. A contractor finds his workmen where he can. He employs them only when he needs them. He lets them go when the job is done. If a building trades journeyman is lucky, he then moves on to another job in another place for a different contractor. And when that job is over he gets let out again.

For most building tradesmen there is no such thing as steady employment, day in and day out, with one employer in one place.

This contrast with manufacturing has made all the difference in the world when it comes to organizing. For example, when factory workers want to band together in a union for their mutual aid and protection, their rights are protected. The law guarantees them an election if they want one. If they vote for a union then the union is certified as their representative. The employer then must bargain with that union. This is the Federal law today under the National Labor Relations Act.

But what about the construction industry? Can we protect the rights of construction workers by holding an election so they can choose their union? The answer is no.

Repeated attempts to hold representation elections in the construction industry have met with defeat. For a dozen years or so the National Labor Relations Board expressly refused to apply the law to this industry. No elections were permitted because the law was intended primarily to protect the rights of workers in the factory rather than on the construction site.

Then after the Taft-Hartley Act was passed the first General Counsel of the Board under that act, Mr. Robert N. Denham, made heroic efforts to apply the new law to the construction site. Even before he began, he recognized some of the difficulties he was bound to encounter. Here is what he said back in 1948:

But, as we approach the construction industry and the trade unions and the contractors that are engaged in it, we find ourselves dealing with something which fits into none of the orthodox categories of industry or employment with which the Board is accustomed to dealing. The whole industry is unique in many ways and the mere pattern of employment differs wholly from that to which we have been accustomed. Neither the employee nor the employer stand on stable ground so far as either identity of the employer or the location of the work is concerned.

And a short time later Mr. Denham threw in the sponge. He found it was hopeless to try to define a bargaining unit in the construction industry both in terms of employers and employees. Except in cases where both employers and union could mutually agree on a bargaining unit for purposes of a consent election, no election was in any way possible. He quickly abandoned



his ambitious program to hold elections in this industry in every area across the country.

It is entirely clear that the election process of the Board is not an adequate means to permit a reasonable opportunity for legitimate organization by trades unions in the building and construction industry.

There is another fundamental difference between factory work and construction employment. Suppose a factory worker has chosen his union in a free, Government-supervised election and his union has negotiated a bargaining agreement covering all production and maintenance workers. Then suppose the plant management decides to exclude all maintenance men, all electricians, plumbers, and repairmen and the benefits of the collective bargaining agreement. Suppose he decides to cut their wage rates.

This could happen except for two very important things. First, this would violate Federal law. Second, every production and maintenance worker could legally walk out and stay home. Their union could put up a peaceful picket line and lawfully persuade every other union member to stay away—to refuse to make pickups and deliveries. The National Labor Relations Board could get a court order against the manufacturer who might try a trick like this, telling him to restore wage scales with back-pay or else face charges of contempt of court.

But can the construction worker protest the same way when the same thing happens to him? Here again, the answer is "No, in most cases he can't," due to the peculiarities of the construction industry and the Denver Building Trades case.

These peculiarities of the construction industry, Mr. Speaker, were first recognized long ago by the building tradesmen themselves. Their only means of self protection was to band together and withhold their services from any contractors who refused to negotiate with them. Their only means of maintaining their organization and of protecting their wages and working conditions from nonunion competition was refusing to work alongside scab labor. No elections, no statutory guarantees could help these unions. Self-help alone would do.

As very aptly stated by Mr. Justice Douglas in his dissent from the Denver Building Trades decision:

The employment of union and nonunion men on the same job is a basic protest in trade union history. That was the protest here. The union was not out to destroy the contractor because of his antiunion attitude. The union was not pursuing the contractor to other jobs. All the union asked was that union men not be compelled to work alongside nonunion men on the same job.

Until this Denver decision in 1951, the protest picket line had been the main way building tradesmen protected their working conditions, and their organizational strength from frontal attack.

Now they are deprived of this one basic means of self-defense and if any-

one thinks for a moment that this isn't harming construction unions, let him take a close look at conditions in Baltimore, as shown by the hearings on this very bill.

Just before the Supreme Court decided the Denver case the Associated Builders and Contractors was incorporated in Baltimore. This group is frankly and openly nonunion from end to end. Today, after 10 years of growth, they can boast of 660 member firms.

What about the union contractors? How have they prospered during the same 10 years? In 1951 the Baltimore Building Trades Council listed 58 general contractors who used union subcontractors. In 1959 the same council listed only five general contractors who used union subcontractors exclusively. Twenty-two others were listed as using sometimes union and sometimes nonunion subcontractors.

How about wages and hours? Taking just a few trades shown by surveys of the city of Baltimore in 1951, the nonunion ABC wage rate ranged from 25 to 71 percent lower than union scales. Today these differentials still persist and the open shop worker puts in 50 or 60 hours a week at straight-time pay.

You might ask: What about the 40-hour week under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act? Does not that apply? The answer is: No—not to most construction, which is strictly local in character. The construction worker is flatly denied the protection of his hours of work which the Federal law guarantees to the factory worker by requiring time-and-a-half pay for overtime after 40 hours.

Now these events in Baltimore undoubtedly have been reenacted in one locality after another across the face of the Nation. In the Denver case itself, for example, the union job was picketed because the union general contractor secured a nonunion electrical contractor who paid his electricians at a basic rate exactly 42½ cents less than the union scale.

Obviously, then, the Denver case is an open invitation to break down hard won wages and working conditions by using contractors who refuse to pay union rates.

Some may claim this bill is just an effort to enforce compulsory unionism.

Mr. Speaker, they could not be more wrong. This bill has nothing whatever to do with compulsory unionism, that is, it has nothing to do with forcing a man to join a union to get a job.

This is outlawed today, under at least two other provisions of the Taft-Hartley act, namely, sections 8(a)(3) and 8(b)(2). If we were to reverse the Denver case tomorrow by passing this bill—and I hope we do—then compulsory unionism—the closed shop—forcing a man to join a union to get a job would still be outlawed tomorrow. And any union trying to deprive or deny a qualified man employment because he is not a union member would be violating the law tomorrow just as it would be today.

No. Mr. Speaker, we have a bread-and-butter issue at stake here. This

issue is whether the law will continue to deny a building tradesman his right to keep his union rates—whether we will continue to permit contractors to undermine these rates by employing men on the same job at wages which, the records show, can be 25 to 71 percent lower, without giving the building and construction unions an adequate opportunity to protect their wage standards.

For our only purpose in this bill is to permit the building tradesman to picket peacefully when someone else threatens to destroy his standard of living and working built by hard efforts over the years. Our simple desire is to make sure the Federal law realistically guarantees the construction worker the same rights the law now guarantees the factory worker.

So much for the merits of H.R. 9070. But before closing I wish to point out a few salient facts about this bill, to correct some erroneous impressions which some may have received.

First, the bill has had thorough consideration. It was proposed as early as 1954 by President Eisenhower whose administration had by then become aware of the harmful impact and basic unfairness of the Denver case. President Eisenhower then stated in a labor message to Congress:

The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent third parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

In response to the President's request, Senator Smith of New Jersey, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, introduced S. 2650, containing omnibus amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act including a special exception to what was then 8(b)(4)(A). Much like H.R. 9070, this exception was confined to the construction industry and to job site disputes between employees of contractors in that industry.

After extensive hearings, S. 2650 was favorably reported—Senate Report No. 1211, 83d Congress, 2d session, Apr. 15, 1954, at page 19.

Next, the same proposal was repeated by President Eisenhower in 1956, and also in 1958, when it became part of a definite legislative program, contained in S. 3099, with language identical with my own bill, H.R. 9070.

In 1959 the same language was repeated in the Kearns bill, H.R. 3540, and was considered last year by the conferees on the Landrum-Griffin bill, and, but for a threatened point of order in the House, would have been included in the conference report.

I can assure the House that a majority of the conferees on the Senate side favored this specific proposal. May I also say that their support resulted from a careful check of the Senate which appeared to them to show a clear majority supporting this measure.

Finally, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague and friend, Representative PERKINS, of Kentucky, held extensive hearings in February of this year for 8 days, during which every interested person had a full opportunity to appear and testify on this bill. Now it has been reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor in a form to which no technical point of order can be raised.

Second, this bill is confined to the construction industry and to the construction industry alone.

Moreover the dispute must be neither unlawful under the National Labor Relations Act nor in violation of an existing collective bargaining agreement. These safeguards prevent use of the picket line for corrupt and dishonest objectives, which, by the way, may be adequately penalized under provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act and other criminal statutes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should not consult false fears that this bill will unleash forces of iniquity upon the industrial world. Instead it is a simple agent of justice which would at last restore and revive a basic and traditional right which the law has taken away.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KILDAY (at the request of Mr. IKARD) for today, on account of official business, being in attendance as a member of the Board of Visitors, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mrs. GRIFFITHS), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. Bow in two instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 743. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

2099. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the procurement of mobile air-conditioning carts for ground support of B-58 airplanes under Department of the Air Force prime contracts with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2100. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the U.S. shrimp fisheries with respect to the specific topics enumerated in the Fish and Wildlife Act, pursuant to section 9(b) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2101. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 15, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Loyalhanna Creek at Latrobe, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. Part 2, additional views on H.R. 9070. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution No. 513. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11713, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7155, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central

Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 11977. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H.R. 11979. A bill to amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 11980. A bill to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11981. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11982. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11983. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 11984. A bill to provide salary adjustments in the basic salary of postal field service employees in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11985. A bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 11986. A bill to clarify the rights of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11987. A bill to foster development of the use of a product of the United States by providing temporarily for the assessment of duty only on the cost of processing and added material when it is exported for intermediate processing and returned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11988. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11989. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11990. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Teacher's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 661. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 662. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 663. Concurrent resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 11991. A bill for the relief of Pinghui Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 11992. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Kearney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11993. A bill for the relief of Rosa Quattrocchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11994. A bill for the relief of Edward T. How and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 11995. A bill for the relief of Manuall Asso Kallabat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11996. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda, Mr. Selichi Yasuda, and Mrs. Tsuru Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 11997. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

444. By Mr. HOGAN: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America requesting a hearing on the denial of the right to elect their own officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

445. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William G. Suzore, city clerk, Lincoln Park, Mich., relative to affirming endorsement of the initial stage of the Trenton Channel Improvement, and requesting enactment of the necessary authorizing legislation; to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### A Most Extraordinary Teacher

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that some of my remarks be entered in the RECORD concerning a much out of the ordinary constituent, Mr. F. L. Stillions, of Blue Springs, Jackson County, Mo.

Mr. Stillions is a teacher by profession. He is not just an ordinary teacher, but one who is distinguished by having just completed 40 years of teaching in the public schools of Missouri; 25 years of which has been in continuous service in Blue Springs, Mo. Mr. Stillions further distinguished himself by being the first teacher in the entire area who insisted he continue in the teaching profession until he reached the mandatory retirement age of 70. Even more remarkable and in further distinguishing Mr. Stillions from so many others in his profession, he has never missed a day of regularly scheduled school during all these years.

Mr. Stillions was born on a small farm south of Palmyra, Mo., in 1890. He graduated from Palmyra High School and entered William Jewel College in Liberty, Mo. This is an institution of learning under the supervision of the Baptist Church. While a student at William Jewel, he became a part-time pastor in Forrest City, Mo. In 1912 he was ordained as a Baptist minister. After his graduation from William Jewel College in 1913, he commenced his service as the

pastor of the Blue Springs Baptist Church which he continued to serve for 17 years.

During the years of his early life it should be remembered this great man served the people of his community as the pastor of their church and carried out an extensive building program in the construction of a new church. Yet not only was he a good minister, but during all these same years he was a teacher in the schools—and not simply was he a teacher of the academic subjects, but he also served as coach of both the boys' and girls' basketball teams. He will be particularly remembered for the fact that he provided transportation for the teams in his own car and at his own personal expense so that the teams he coached might enter competitive sports in other towns. For 2 consecutive years, 1935-36, his basketball team won the championship award.

Then in the year 1947 when most people of his age—age 57 at that time—are thinking of retiring, Mr. Stillions entered the University of Kansas City and completed work for his master's degree.

In his 40 years as a teacher, Mr. Stillions spent 27 years as a high school principal. It is refreshing to note that Mr. Stillions was not a specialist in that he confined his teaching activities to one bracket of subjects, but was a very versatile teacher in that he taught Latin, English history, algebra, geometry, and even chemistry in the field of the sciences.

When Mr. Stillions retires at the end of the current school year he will have the unusual distinction of having been teacher to three generations within one family, Mrs. Raymond W. (Maurine) Wyatt, her son, R. W. Wyatt, and her

grandson, Donnie Wyatt, now a senior who will graduate this year.

Probably no other man has had such a profound effect on the lives of so many people in the Blue Springs community. As teacher, minister, husband, and father, he has given his unselfish devotion to each status. His efforts have helped thousands of young people to a better life and his influence has thus extended far beyond the community of Blue Springs.

In the presentation which will be made to Mr. Stillions, there will be the Latin inscription, "Existi monumentum aere perennius," meaning "You have completed a monument more enduring than bronze." Nothing could be more fitting to describe the life of this great teacher.

### Payroll Study

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a salary increase for postal workers appears to be heading toward a deadlock between those who believe circumstances require an immediate increase and those who wish to postpone action until we have the benefit of the BLS study of the entire Federal payroll structure.

In order to take care of the most pressing needs of the postal employees, while recognizing the wisdom of a general payroll revision, I suggest that we enact a